

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 1892.

The Week.

THE culmination of absurdity in the conduct of a national convention seems unquestionably to have been reached at Chicago, and it fully justified the resolution introduced by Gen. Collins of Massachusetts, that "the Democratic National Committee be instructed to provide in the next National Convention the accommodations necessary for the delegates, the alternates, the press, the National Committee, and none others." Modified into a recommendation instead of an instruction, this resolution was adopted. Gen. Collins was also able to maintain his reputation for consistency by pointing to the fact that he offered a similar resolution twelve years ago. He said "the time was not then ripe" for such a step, but he thought the events of this year's Convention would make everybody ready for it. Certainly there could not well be anything more ridiculous than to ask 900 delegates to act as a "deliberative assembly" with 15,000 people about and above them making pandemonium, and attempting to control their action by insensate howling. No presiding officer can keep such a mob in order, nor can any speaker make himself heard in their presence. Moreover, the theory that advantage can come to a candidate by having a preponderance of shrieking adherents in the gallery has completely broken down. Lincoln's nomination in 1860 may have been aided by the great expression of local sympathy inside the Convention, but the enthusiasm of packed galleries has since been always discounted, and has no effect whatever except to distract and exasperate the delegates. The scenes this year at Chicago were worse than those at Minneapolis only because the opportunities for disorder and turbulence were greater. Both parties ought to see the absurdity and indecency of present methods, and devise measures to make their national conventions more like gatherings of rational beings.

Mr. Cleveland owed his easy victory on the first ballot to the support of those Northern States which the Democrats must carry in order to elect him. New Jersey, the one State in the North which has gone Democratic in every Presidential contest for twenty years, cast every one of her twenty votes for Cleveland. Michigan, which under the new district system is sure to choose several Democratic electors, was unanimous for him. Indiana and Connecticut, which are always close and doubtful, were both of them solid for him. Illinois and Wisconsin, two of the old Republican States in the West which even

Republicans concede to be close this year, cast every one of their votes for Cleveland. The same was true of New Hampshire and Rhode Island, two corresponding States in the East, and four-fifths of the delegates from Massachusetts were for Cleveland. In other words, outside of New York, every State in the North which the Democrats have ever carried in a Presidential contest, or stand any chance of carrying now, was overwhelmingly in favor of the candidate who was chosen. This is exactly the way a candidate ought to be selected.

The delegation chosen by the Syracuse Convention accomplished the unprecedented result of securing its object without admission to the National Convention. That object was to demonstrate to the Democrats of the country that the snap convention did not represent the real sentiments of the Democracy of New York, and that its claim that Cleveland could not carry the State was baseless. How thoroughly the demonstration was made, and how effective it proved, is shown by the result of the first ballot. Whether the men who brought this about were actually admitted to seats in the Convention was a matter of no consequence; and if it gives pleasure to anybody to rejoice because they were not, they would be the last people in the world to object.

"Oh, they have the mass-meetings and the brass bands, but I am getting the delegates." Such was the remark of David B. Hill in Brooklyn on the 10th of February last, when he was "fixing things" for his snap convention. What he meant by it was that Cleveland had the people on his side, but that he (Hill) had the Machine, and the Machine would control the Convention. Mr. Hill has learned something as to the power of public sentiment and the weakness of the Machine since last February. When the ballot was taken, he received in the whole United States, outside of New York, the votes of only forty delegates, while even Boies of Iowa secured seventy-seven outside his own delegation. The history of our politics does not present a more impressive spectacle of a demagogue's downfall. Even his sole claim to distinction, that "I am a Democrat," is now gone, for, after he had learned the will of his party, he persisted in an utterly undemocratic attempt to thwart it. Now that he is at last fully exposed, he is seen to be so weak and contemptible that the thought of connecting him with the Presidency seems an insult to common sense.

The Democratic candidate for Vice-President in the campaign of 1892 is not so well known to the country at large as

the gentlemen who were associated with Mr. Cleveland in 1888 and 1884, but nobody could ask a better character than is given Mr. Stevenson by his Republican neighbors of Bloomington, Ill. His political strength among those who know him best has been twice demonstrated by his election to Congress from a district which is normally Republican; and it was a pleasant feature of the reception given him on his return from Chicago last Friday, that Gen. McNulta, the Republican whom he defeated in these two contests, headed the parade and delivered the speech of welcome. The local Republican newspapers were quite as complimentary and hearty. Says one of them: "Mr. Stevenson is a gentleman of unimpeachable character, and his political friends will have no reason to apologize for him in that particular, and of him they may tell the truth, without shame to themselves or scandal to their party." It would be unfair not to recognize the service rendered by Tammany in the Convention in preventing the nomination of Gray and securing that of Stevenson. Whatever the motive, the effect was a distinct gain for the Democratic ticket.

There will be 444 votes in the Electoral College this year, so that the successful candidate must secure at least 223. The "solid South" casts 159, and, despite the talk about two or three of these States being doubtful, nobody whose judgment is worth anything doubts that the Force Bill issue will carry every one for the Democratic candidate. New Jersey's 10 may be counted with equal confidence on the same side. The *Detroit Tribune*, the leading Republican organ of Michigan, admits that the Democrats will get at least four votes from that State. This makes 173 which may be called "sure." Connecticut and Indiana would add 6 and 15 respectively, making 194, and New York's 36 would carry the total up to 230, or seven more than a majority. The Republicans are relatively better off than before by reason of the admission of the new States and the changes in older States caused by the reapportionment, but the combination of 1876 and 1884 would carry the day again in 1892. There are chances for Cleveland this year in other States which no Democratic candidate has had in previous years, and it is possible that he might lose New York and still carry the country; but in all probability New York will again be, as so often before, "the pivotal State."

In the course of his eulogy on the McKinley Bill, in his reply to the notification of his renomination, President Harrison spoke of the increased exports to nations concerned in the reciprocity treaties. Of this very increase it is instructive to notice that the Acting Secretary of State, in a

report submitted to the Senate on the day of the President's speech, observes that "it is scarcely just to measure, as it is useless to conjecture, the results that have, or may, come from the advantages afforded by the reciprocity negotiations." These are at least the words of a practical student; but President Harrison hampers himself by no such qualifications. A brief study of the facts would have-taught the President that the increase in our export trade with these reciprocity nations was almost exactly 3 per cent. of the increase in the year's total exports. In other words, the nations with which we have no reciprocity treaties have increased their imports from the United States in almost exactly the same measure as the nations now revelling in such treaties. The fact is, however, that the President was talking of meat and breadstuff exports. His assertion, therefore, amounts to this: that our huge exports of produce this season, and the higher prices paid to the farmers, are the direct results of the late protectionist legislation. Well-meaning but hasty reasoners have been ascribing the strangely distributed harvest of 1891, to which our enormous exports were due, to the vagaries of nature or the dispensation of Providence. Mr. Harrison brushes aside such notions in a single sentence. The great American harvest of 1891 and the great grain export were, in his view, due to one factor only—the McKinley Bill. When it is added that the "numerous reciprocal trade agreements" under the McKinley Bill, to whose auspicious agency Mr. Harrison traces so many blessings, went into effect, for the most part, some six months after the harvest of 1891 was gathered, astonishment grows into something like adoration.

There seems to be a peculiar fate attaching to President Harrison's messages relating to international disputes. They immediately excite a controversy over the question whether a satisfactory answer from the foreign country was not actually in Washington at the time the message was sent in. In the Chilean intrigue, if the apology from Chili was not in the President's hands when he sent his war-like message to Congress, it was only because the telegraph could not work fast enough to get it there. And now, immediately after his message calling for retaliation on Canada, the report comes from Ottawa that a reply from the Canadian Government was in Washington at the time. This is indignantly denied at the White House: the Canadian communication was not received, it is virtuously said, until some hours after the message was sent to the Senate. It must be admitted that the "just in time" character of the message is thereby fully vindicated. But it must occur to the President that it would have been better if he had waited for the promised communication, especially in view of the fact that

his call for retaliation was at once pronounced to be silly by the chief organ of his party, edited by his associate on the Republican ticket.

The letter of the counsel of the Produce Exchange to that body on a phase of the Anti-Option Bill now before the Senate Judiciary Committee, ought to enlist against that measure the sympathy and active work of the large and important grocery and provision trades, wholesale and retail. Almost all grocers sell lard, pork, bacon, and other edible products of swine. Every day, wholesalers sell to retail grocers and provision dealers, and these to customers, hog products which they have not in their possession. In fact, it is the common custom in all trades to contract to deliver small quantities of goods which the sellers do not own at time of sale. In every such case of future sales of grain or hog products the traders would be brought under the Anti-Option Bill if it became a law. If a grocer at the time of such "future" sale had a contract with bona-fide owners of lard or pork to supply him with the quantities needed for his trade, such a grocer would have to procure an expensive license for so doing, and would be compelled to keep a record of his transactions which must be open to the inspection of the Collector of Internal Revenue. If, on the other hand, a grocer should sell lard or pork which he at the time of sale did not own or had not contracted for with some bona-fide owner, then the penalties of the Hatch Bill would apply, and they are so heavy as to mean ruin to the ordinary dealer, including fine and imprisonment. The effect would be the same if the salesmen of any wholesale house should happen to sell hog products to retail dealers when their firm at the time did not have the goods on hand. With such absurd and ruinous provisions, it may be expected that the grocery and provision trade, jobbers and retailers, will make their influence felt against the proposed legislation.

We recently animadverted on a decision of the Board of General Appraisers assessing duties upon old books that had been newly rebound, on the ground that a construction of paragraph 512 of the free list, as amended by the McKinley Act, rendered old books, bound or rebound within twenty years, liable to duty. We are glad to note that in a suit brought to recover duty paid under this ruling, the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts decided, on June 2, in favor of the plaintiff. The paragraph in question reads: "Books, engravings, photographs, bound or unbound etchings, maps, and charts, which shall have been printed and bound or manufactured more than twenty years at the date of importation." Judge Putnam, who rendered the decision of the

court, seems to hold the opinion we previously expressed, that the inserted italicized words were intended to remove the doubt cast upon the Treasury Department rulings which held that unbound books were not entitled to free entry, by the opinion of the Attorney-General to the contrary. He says:

"It is my belief that the change in the phraseology which appears in the Act of October 1, 1890, paragraph 512, so far as it reaches the present case, should be construed as intended to remove this doubt, and to make certain that the general policy concerning this subject-matter was not extended as the opinion of the Attorney-General permitted." "This was," he continues, "perhaps, sought to be accomplished by striking out the comma after 'unbound'—for whatever such striking out might be worth—so as, perhaps, to make that word limit what followed it, and not what preceded. It was reached effectually and certainly by inserting 'bound or' after the words 'printed and.' The present paragraph 512 is therefore to be construed distributively, the words 'printed and bound' referring to whatever should be bound to complete it as an article of merchandise, and 'printed' and 'manufactured' to everything else. I discover no evidence of any other change of legislative purpose so far as relates to printed books."

Judge Putnam holds that in the case of books which have been bound more than twenty years before importation, "as books of like character are usually bound before being offered for sale," such books are entitled to free entry as complying with the precise terms of the present statute; and as to books rebound he adds: "I would regard them as entitled to free entry, even though it also appeared that, in consequence of accident or ordinary use, they had needed and received repairs in all respects equal in extent to new and original binding." It is understood that the Treasury Department has already notified Custom-house officials that they are to be governed by this decision; so it is to be presumed that there will be no further assessment of duty on old books on the score of new binding. But how the decision is to apply in the case, for example, of books printed more than twenty years and kept in the original sheets until shortly before importation; and then newly bound, it is difficult to see; and on whom is the burden of proof as to the facts in the case, the importer or the United States?

Protection, like negro slavery, is a principle which cannot be allowed to stand still. Once conceded to be right in itself, the one movement, as was the case with the other, is morally bound to be advanced into new fields and carried to its remotest logical extremes. The manufacturers of Australia have discovered another possible step in the logical series. Bitter complaint has lately arisen among the Melbourne manufacturers of flour, tallow, leather, and preserved meats, that the "raw material" of their industry is exported to foreign countries, there to be turned into the finished commodity. The manufacturers protest that if the

farmers and cattlemen were compelled to bring their product to local manufacturers instead of sending them to foreigners, local business would be enlarged and thousands of Australians be employed in making the flour and tallow and leather which are now turned out by the pauper labor of England. On this ground, they have begun by demanding, at a public mass-meeting, that the Victorian Government levy an export duty of one penny a pound on raw sheepskins. The demand of the tanners will naturally be echoed, as applied to their own commodities, by the millers and the grocers; and inasmuch as Victoria is not, like the United States, hampered by a constitutional prohibition of export duties, it is hard to see how a protectionist Legislature can consistently refuse the demand. Indeed, the arguments in favor of the export tariff sound like an extract from a McKimley debate. Not one protectionist catchword is missing, from the "pauper labor of Europe" to "Australian markets for Australian workmen." This is only a fresh illustration of the fact that protectionist fallacies are best exposed by pushing the principle to its logical extreme.

The election address which Mr. Gladstone has issued puts home rule for Ireland in the foremost place. This could hardly be avoided, but in England, as in this country, the matter has lost some of its interest. No question can occupy the attention of the public for a very long time without becoming tiresome, and the Irish question has for a number of years given rise to a prodigious amount of discussion. But, whether the English people are tired of it or not, it is really the only question upon which the parties can divide. There are many subjects upon which action would probably be taken by the Liberals which the Conservatives would condemn, and vice versa, but these subjects are for the most part of no national importance, and could hardly bring about a change of government. Mr. Gladstone criticises the English Local-Government Bill and the bill intended to encourage the growth of a class of peasant proprietors, known as the Agricultural Holdings Bill; but even in regard to these measures the differences between the parties relate to matters of detail. Upon the proposed law making eight hours the universal day of labor Mr. Gladstone is rather non-committal, but reminds the working-classes that their true strength, after all, is closely connected with personal liberty. He speaks favorably of the payment of members of Parliament who represent these classes, and if this means their payment by the Government, it is very significant of democratic progress. But the report leaves it uncertain whether Mr. Gladstone did more than approve the practice already established, in accordance with which the miners have raised a salary for their member by voluntary contribution.

The general reduction of the rate of interest has been taken advantage of by the British Government in making a new contract with the Bank of England. By the terms of this contract the Government will save about £45,700 a year, a reduction which some of the Bank directors complain of as extortionate, and which in fact amounts to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent. on the Bank's capital. But this complaint, while natural, is not well grounded, for there is no reason why the Bank should not accept $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. instead of 3 per cent. on the Government debt of £11,000,000, since all the other creditors of the State have accepted a like reduction, and this difference in interest accounts for more than half the saving. After 1903 it is further provided that the rate shall be only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but if this is not satisfactory to the Bank, the Government may continue the loan at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. or pay the debt, at its option. The rest of the reduction is in the allowances to the Bank for various financial services, which allowances are deemed still sufficiently liberal by the *Economist*. It must not be forgotten that the Bank derives an annual profit of something like £100,000 from the privilege of issuing its notes against the debt of the Government, and that it has no legal claim to the perpetuation of this privilege beyond the periods from time to time agreed upon.

The interview with Prince Bismarck published by the *Neue Freie Presse* of Vienna is accepted as authentic by the German newspapers, whose comments on it are naturally severe. There has seldom been so much washing of domestic linen before the public eye. Not only does the ex-Chancellor in this interview disparage his successor, but he affirms that Germany has incurred the ill-will of Russia by his (Bismarck's) removal from office. It follows from this that nobody but Bismarck could insure the peace of Europe—a conclusion from which the Prince does not shrink. The peace of Europe may be preserved without him by a run of luck, but there can be nothing like a guarantee of it. "They reckon ill who leave me out," is the burden of his song. The *Tageblatt* of Leipzig is right in saying that Bismarck when in office hunted men to their ruin for saying far less than he has said in this interview. The *Freisinnige* journals, on the other hand, say that if it be true that the Czar is less friendly to Germany than he was during the Bismarck régime, Germany is now more united and self-reliant, and therefore better able to meet her enemies. The interview will certainly make the barrier between Bismarck and the Emperor impassable, and will reconcile most of the Prince's former supporters to his retirement from political life; for such a publication cannot be counted patriotic. It may be all true, but it is certainly dis-

turbing. Indeed, it is hard to imagine a more disquieting communication coming from a person not charged with the responsibilities of office.

The three per cent. bonds of the French Republic, commonly known as *rentes*, have risen to par, and the French papers are naturally expressing much pleasure at this evidence of the credit of the Government. It was in 1824 that the three per cent. *rente* was introduced, when it sold for 75, and soon after fell to 60, but rose in 1829 to 80. The revolution of 1830 sent it down again to 60, but the conservative Government of Louis Philippe caused it to appreciate steadily until about 1846, when it sold at 84. The revolution of 1848 drove the price down to 50, but it struggled up to 56, and the establishment of the Empire caused a bound upward to 75 in 1852 and 79 in 1853. Yet after this the Empire seems to have lacked credit, for the *rente* ranged between 60 and 70 for a number of years. Just before the war with Prussia, when there was for a short time a belief that peace was assured, the price of 75 was attained, but the disaster of 1870 reduced it to 52 in October of that year. From that time on, the appreciation has been upon the whole steady, but the enormous expenditure of the Government evidently caused alarm, for from 85 in 1881 it fell to 78 in 1884. It thus appears that it has risen 20 francs in less than eight years, and during the last three years alone the rise has been 15 per cent. These fluctuations constitute a miniature history of the course of political events in France, but the extraordinary rise during the last few years, we apprehend, is due mainly to causes that have affected the rate of interest the world over, although due in part to certain financial measures adopted by the French Government.

There is a brilliant opening for a quorum-counter in the Brazilian Congress which it would be well worth the while of ex-Speaker Reed, in his present condition of political disinterestedness, to consider. The Congress should have met on May 3, but took things easy and did not attempt a session before the 12th. Even then no quorum was present. That state of things continued for five successive days. Finally, on the 18th, the legal number was got together and organization was partially effected, but the quorum immediately disappeared, and it was not until nearly a month after the date fixed by law that Congress was ready for business. Various feeble excuses were presented, such as the fact that the President had exiled and imprisoned so many Congressmen that it was difficult to get a quorum, but we are sure that a good energetic Czar for Speaker would have figured out a "potential" quorum even under such discouraging circumstances.

MR. CLEVELAND'S CANDIDACY.

THE nomination of Mr. Cleveland is the most encouraging political event which has occurred in this country since the war. In many respects it resembles the second nomination of Lincoln, for, like that, it has been compelled by the people in spite of the combined opposition of the professional politicians. Every patriotic American, no matter what his political affiliations may be, has reason to rejoice over it, for it is at once a triumph for our methods of selecting Presidential candidates, and an immediate and, we trust, permanent uplifting of the level of our political discussion. It gives assurance that the campaign before us will be one of the most creditable ever conducted in this country. The nomination of no other Democratic candidate could have brought this about, for, without disparaging any of those who were mentioned in opposition to Mr. Cleveland, it is to be said that his personal character stands for more, in the estimation of the people, than that of any other American of his time.

Mr. Cleveland is, in fact, the candidate of the people, as Lincoln was, and as Washington and Jackson had been before him. He has done nothing to secure the nomination, but many things which seemed certain in the eyes of time-servers and trimmers to deprive him of all chance of obtaining it. He has been a private citizen for four years, going into private life after a defeat which he had brought upon himself and his party by his own deliberate act. In his retirement he made a public deliverance on a burning question of the day in which he placed himself squarely in opposition to what was generally believed to be an overwhelming majority of his party. Yet because he was honest and courageous, both in the step which cost him a reelection and in the subsequent public utterance, he has accomplished the seemingly miraculous feat of converting his party, in practically solid mass, to his way of thinking. He is to-day not merely its nominee, but its platform. He has brought it to his position both on the tariff and on silver, and in doing this has performed a service of inestimable value to the country.

Especially is this true of the silver question. When he wrote his letter to the Cooper Institute meeting in February, 1891, it was known that the huge Democratic majority in the new Congress was overwhelmingly in favor of free and unlimited silver coinage, and there seemed to be no possibility of defeating the passage of a free-coinage bill when that Congress should assemble in the following December. Mr. Cleveland, by putting himself in direct and open opposition to this majority, was supposed by many observers to have ended his political career. It is now plain that he saved the country from the most baleful financial blunder which has ever threatened it, and saved his party also from the consequen-

ces of such a blunder. He stopped the passage of the Free-Coinage Bill in Congress, and has now stopped his party from the further consideration of such a bill by bringing it squarely upon a platform which, in plain and unmistakable language, binds it against free and unlimited silver coinage. These are the services and achievements which make all honest men of both parties speak with respect of Mr. Cleveland's character, and which make his candidacy an honor to his party and to American politics. They will constitute his chief strength in the approaching campaign.

There could be no stronger evidence of the public value of his nomination than is found in the tributes which his political opponents pay to it. "We do not," says the *Philadelphia Press*, "underestimate Mr. Cleveland's strength. We are not unmindful that he has won a large measure of confidence in his personal rectitude and purposes. He is a worthy adversary, and insures a battle of principles and not of personalities." "Republicans do not underrate Mr. Cleveland," says the Republican candidate for the Vice-Presidency. "No Republican will disparage either his strength, his sincerity, or his character. His nomination will make it sure that we shall have a clean canvass of discussion and not of vituperation. I do not believe that Mr. Cleveland is as strong as he was in '84, nor even as strong as in '88. Yet I think he enjoys more of the respect of his opponents than he ever did before. And the devotion of his followers is such that they will surely give us a very hard fight." To these high testimonies from representative Republican authorities in the East are to be added equally flattering ones from similar authorities in the West. The *Chicago Inter-Ocean* says: "There is a universal respect for Mr. Cleveland as a man having convictions that he will not sacrifice for his personal aggrandizement. We believe that a large majority of the voters of the United States consider the economic opinions of Mr. Cleveland to be ill-grounded, but we feel sure that a majority of the people feel more kindly towards a man who honestly believes in that which is untrue, than a man who would conceal his own belief and suppress that of his party for the purpose of deceiving the voters." Surely the nomination of such a candidate, against the power of the political machines of his party and without the aid of a particle of patronage of any kind, is an achievement which should inspire new faith in the capacity of the people of this country for popular government. No demagogue ever had a support capable of accomplishing a result like this, which has been won by simple adherence to common honesty and implicit trust in the "brave old wisdom of sincerity."

Whatever the result of the election, the action of both National Conventions combines to assure us a campaign of rational

discussion, in which an intelligent citizen can join without loss of either temper or self-respect. Both political parties have succeeded in showing that they are stronger than their self-elected bosses, and are not afraid to go forward in defiance of the latter's wishes. It will not be wise for either party to calculate upon much help for its candidate from the treachery of these baffled and defeated political gamblers in the other. This is to be an election in which "treachery" and "knifing" will play no decisive parts. Both parties are threatened about equally, and the harm which one suffers is likely to be counterbalanced pretty evenly by that of the other. When the time to vote comes, we shall take the ballot for the first time in our history in absolute secrecy, and more free from corrupting and contaminating influences than ever before. All this is as encouraging as it is gratifying to every American who loves his country and has her welfare at heart.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

THE two planks in the platform adopted by the Democratic Convention last week which will above all others fix the attention of the country are those on the tariff and on silver. The corresponding parts of the Republican platform were regarded with equal propriety as the vital articles of the Republican profession of political faith. About them will rage the battle in the next four months. The other planks are of minor or local importance. Our first comments will therefore be upon the remarkable utterances of the Democratic party on the questions of tariff taxation and the currency.

The tariff plank may justly be called remarkable both on account of its tenor and the manner of its adoption. It squarely toes the mark on the great issue that now divides parties in this country. Without any circumlocutions or ambiguities, it declares protective legislation to be class legislation, the "robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few." All the vain qualifications about "incidental protection" and "wise adjustments" are for ever abandoned, and the flat-footed demand is made that tariff taxes "shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered." Moreover, this "fundamental principle of the Democratic party" is wisely based upon the denial of any constitutional power in the Federal Government to levy protective taxes. This is simply appealing to the underlying idea of all free government—equality before the law. Whatever a partisan Supreme Court may have decided or may yet decide on this question, it will remain an ineradicable conviction of the mass of the people that to interpret into the Constitution the right of one class to enrich itself at the expense of another, is possible only through legal jugglery, and is in defiance of the principles of

equality and even-handed justice on which our Government was founded.

These clear and fearless declarations on the tariff show that the Democratic party has at last found its voice. They involve a more direct and profound comprehension of the inherent injustice of protection than has ever found expression in any party platform in this country. The Democratic party of the forties boldly opposed Whig protectionism, it is true, but Whig protectionism was free trade itself beside the monstrosities that have since fastened themselves on our laws in the name of protection. The Democratic platform of 1876 declared for a tariff for revenue only, but that was only a minor incident of the campaign at the time, as the tariff was not then an issue. Republican State conventions of the period adopted the same plank without debate. But within the last few years the issue has been coming to the front as the arrogant demands of tariff beneficiaries and the wrongs inflicted upon the people under the guise of protection have become more evident. The Democratic party has been headed right for the past three Presidential campaigns, and has declared its position in steadily clearer and more courageous tones. This year it comes out into the open, gives over futile dallying with protection, which it has at last found out to be wholly and altogether "a fraud," and forces the fighting on the entire dishonest system.

It is remarkable that this outspoken plank was put into the platform by the body of the delegates against the wishes of the majority of the Committee on Resolutions. The plank originally reported by that Committee was well enough in its main positions, feebly expressed though they were in comparison with the form of words finally chosen, but was guilty of the incredible stupidity of dragging after it an explanatory appendix in which the old protection devil could easily shelter himself. This was entirely to mistake the temper of the Convention. The timidity of other years clung to the Committee, but the mass of the delegates flung it off completely. They had just been cheering Chairman Wilson's hot denunciations of "law-made wealth," and were in no mood to listen to shuffling words about "industries that have come to rely upon legislation." With a better sense of the righteousness of their cause than many of their leaders, and with a better, because more instinctive, appreciation of the course to which the party is led by political wisdom as well as political honor, they insisted upon ever renouncing the protection devil and all his works.

The silver plank is of great importance, though it will probably play but a small part in the canvass. It might easily have been of chief importance. If the Democratic party had run violently down a steep place into the sea of free silver, into which it seemed bent on plunging six or even three months ago, nothing that it could have said about the tariff could

have saved it. But it has wrought out for itself a great deliverance, and made a currency plank which will leave wholly on its side whatever advantage is to be gained from discussing the silver issue in the campaign. For there can be no question among honest men that the Democratic plank on silver is infinitely better than the Republican. The latter is admitted by the *Tribune* to be capable of meaning free coinage of silver; and Senator Teller says it does mean that, and accepts it as satisfactory for that reason. No one can say the same of the Democratic position, which is that "the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal *intrinsic* and exchangeable value." Those Republican organs in the East which have been dismayed at the "straddle" of their own party on the silver question, and have been comforting themselves with the thought that the Democrats would be guilty of a worse one, will see that word *intrinsic*, and at once conclude that free coinage is not an issue.

We think ourselves that it will be but a minor issue; but whatever fighting there is on it, and whatever votes on it are gained in doubtful States, will prove to be to the advantage of the Democrats. They have surpassed the most sanguine expectations on this point, and will strengthen the faith of thinking men in the safety of the republic by the new proof they have given of the power of argument and education to break down and destroy a threatening popular delusion.

IS PROTECTION GAINING GROUND?

THE platform adopted by the Republican party reaffirms the "American doctrine of Protection," and calls attention to its growth abroad. It is hardly necessary to say that neither in the theories of protection expounded in this country, nor in the attempted application of these theories in tariffs, is there anything distinctively American. There is not an argument advanced in support of these theories that has not been urged almost from the beginning of time, or that will not, we fear, be heard till the crack of doom. The fear of foreign contamination constitutes a large part of early religion, the jealousy of strangers is the distinguishing feature of early politics, and the prevention of competition has been the end and aim of most commercial regulation and legislation from the dawn of history to the present day. The Phœnicians, the first people to engage extensively in manufacturing and commerce of which history has given us much record, were noted for the savage spirit with which they attacked those who interfered with their monopoly, and Pericles called the attention of the Athenians to the fact that they were the only people who allowed foreigners free access to their markets. Even in England protective duties existed down to 1860, and the policy of free trade has never been acceptable to a considerable portion of her people.

But, disregarding the "question-begging epithet" American, let us inquire whether in fact protection is growing abroad. As to England, attempts have been made and will continue to be made in this country to represent Lord Salisbury's speech as signifying a change in public sentiment if not in commercial policy. But as the comment of the English press reaches us we are struck with the unanimity with which the doctrine of the speech is condemned. It finds approval only among inveterate protectionists, and is condemned even by most of these as injudicious and inopportune. Moreover, it has directed attention to the history of the free-trade movement, with the result not only of showing the vast gain which it has brought to England, but also of exhibiting Lord Salisbury's blunders and misrepresentations of history with such clearness as to make his position extremely humiliating. It will not be foreign to the purpose to review some of the evidence upon this subject.

"Forty or fifty years ago," says Lord Salisbury, "everybody believed that free trade had conquered the world, and they prophesied that every nation would follow the example of England, and give itself up to absolute free trade." But England does not now enjoy absolute free trade, and certainly did not enjoy anything of the kind in 1842. Even in 1853 many protective duties were in force. The example of England at that time, therefore, was merely of a tendency away from protection, and, moreover, this example was generally followed. Furthermore, nobody believed at the period referred to that free trade had conquered the world, owing, perhaps, to the fact that nowhere in the world did it prevail. As to prophecies, it may be granted that Mr. Cobden indulged in some that were highly optimistic, but what is hoped for by an enthusiastic reformer is not accurately described as the prophecy of everybody. The Anti-Corn-Law League in England was made up of members of the middle class and the more intelligent workmen, and it would be more nearly correct to say that forty or fifty years ago "everybody," of social consequence at least, detested its motives and disbelieved its prophecies.

Upon this point it will be instructive to make some quotations, which we take from an admirable work just published by Cassell & Co., entitled 'Industrial Freedom,' by B. R. Wise, formerly Attorney-General of New South Wales. In 1887 Mr. John Bright wrote to Mr. Wise:

"I never held the opinion that the reform of the tariff would be at once followed by a like change of policy in other countries. If Mr. Cobden expressed such an opinion, of which I have no recollection, I can only say that he had more faith in the common sense of other nations than I had. . . . Further, I would assert without fear of error that our adherence to our free-trade policy is the more necessary and advantageous to us, seeing that other countries have not yet followed our example. Surely, if other nations injure us by their high duties, it would be no compensation to us to put difficulties in the way of our buying what we want. It would be better if we were free to buy and to sell, but

to make it difficult to buy by high duties in our tariff, because foreign tariff makes it difficult to sell, seems to me an idea that can only be entertained by men who are totally unable to reason."

In 1846 Sir R. Peel said in the House of Commons, in a speech on the Corn Laws:

"I fairly avow to you that, in making this great reduction upon the import of articles—the produce and manufacture of foreign countries—I have no guarantee to give you that other countries will immediately follow our example. I give you that advantage in the argument. Wearied with our long and unavailing efforts to enter into satisfactory commercial treaties with other nations, we have resolved at length to consult our own interests, and not to punish those other countries for the wrong they do us in continuing their high duties upon the importation of our products and manufactures by continuing high duties ourselves. . . . You may, therefore, say in opposition to the present plan, What is this superfluous liberality, that you are going to do away with all these duties, and yet you expect nothing in return? I may, perhaps, be told that many foreign countries, since the former relaxation of duties on our part—foreign countries which have benefited by our relaxation—have not followed our example; nay, have not only not followed our example, but have actually applied to the importation of British goods higher rates of duties than formerly. I quite admit it. I give you all the benefit of that argument. . . . But what has been the result upon the amount of your exports? You have defied the regulations of those countries. Your export trade has enormously increased."

In 1849, Mr. Disraeli having laid down the same dogma that Lord Salisbury has just announced, "that you cannot fight hostile tariffs with free imports," Peel replied: "I so totally dissent from that assumption that I maintain that the best way to compete with hostile tariffs is to encourage free imports." It would be easy to multiply these quotations, but we have said enough to show that the protectionist arguments of to-day are the same as of old, that the agitation of "reciprocity" is but the stirring up of a theory deliberately abandoned when free trade was introduced, and that protection has gained ground in England only in the sense that ignorance is constantly gaining ground from education, which is won back again as knowledge is increased. As to commercial legislation on the Continent, we can only say on this occasion that the present tendency is decidedly towards freer trade.

ITALY AND THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE.

THE impression has generally prevailed that the great increase of taxation in Italy has been caused by the enormous armament required by the conditions of the Triple Alliance. This impression is declared to be incorrect by Sig. Crispi, who contributes an article upon the subject to the July number of the *North American Review*. He points out that it was but a generation ago that nearly the whole of Italy was under the rule of despotisms of the most reactionary character. The material progress which distinguishes this century had under these governments scarcely begun, while it is notorious that the expenditure of money for the education of the common people

would have been regarded by most of them as an act of suicidal madness. Such railroads as were constructed were principally for strategic purposes, the highways were neglected, telegraphs had scarcely been introduced, and free communication and progress in general were discouraged as having a dangerous tendency to lead to free thought and free speech.

When the new kingdom was created, therefore, it was far behind in the industrial race. What other countries had begun in 1830 it had to begin in 1860, and the expenditure of two generations has been crowded into the lifetime of one. Thus in 1861 Italy had but 2,561 kilometres of railroad, while she has now 15,600, but at an increased expense of 4,300 millions francs. In like manner what we should call the "River and Harbor Bill" demands three times what was wanted in 1862, and has consumed extraordinary appropriations amounting to 678 millions of francs during the last decade. Public education, too, has had to be dealt with from the foundation up, and in many ways the backward condition of the country has had to be remedied at great expense.

Signor Crispi, however, makes very little of this argument. In point of fact, it would be to a considerable extent irrelevant to the question of the financial policy of the Government, because private enterprise would have furnished the railroads at far less cost than the State. English capital rejoices to pour itself forth in waste places, and the money that has with some trepidation been risked in South America, would have been spent most gladly in furnishing Italy with a complete network of railways. Abandoning this argument, therefore, Signor Crispi endeavors to show that the political situation, not the Triple Alliance, compelled Italy to spend enormous sums for military purposes, and that it is this expenditure which has embarrassed her finances.

This situation, according to Sig. Crispi, required arming with a view to resisting attack from France and Austria. These Powers, he says, have more than once sought to dominate Italy. But he fails to answer the question, Will they do so hereafter? The answer to this question shows the folly of the Italian policy. England is exposed to attack all over the world, and a powerful armament is a necessity for her if she is to maintain her position. Austria is obliged to be in readiness for a Russian attack, and Germany for an attack from both Russia and France. But Italy is protected not only by nature, but by the public sentiment of the world. Her territory is defined by the language of its inhabitants and by the mountains and the seas that enclose it. No Power desires to annex any of her provinces, and none has any wish to attack her. She is as secure without a soldier as with an enormous army. Perhaps she is more secure, for, as the recent experience of the United States has shown, people who

come into possession of military appliances are anxious to put them to the test of practice. It is true that a certain rancor toward Italy has prevailed in France because Italy did not hasten to her assistance in 1870, but this rancor is not enough to make the French commit the folly of trying to dismember Italy; and unless they attempt that, there is no reason why Italy should keep in arms. Most of this rancor, indeed, is due to Italy's militant attitude and to its entering the Triple Alliance.

While it may be true, as Sig. Crispi says, that "it occurs to no one in old and turbulent Europe that the nation should disarm," it does not follow that "liberty is not secure and the independence of the country is always in danger unless its citizens be armed." "Turbulent Europe" has been peaceful enough for almost a quarter of a century, and when the next war comes, it will be one in which Italy need take no part, so far as her own defence is concerned. Signor Crispi mentions the fact that in 1873 it was ascertained that the navy upon which so much had been spent was worthless, and that the vessels might as well be destroyed. He shows that Italy can mobilize only 1,200,000 men, one-fifth of the number that the three Powers on the frontier can bring against her, while the two seas that wash her shores can be adequately defended only by two fleets. It is evident, therefore, that Italy could not resist a combined attack, while no Power would threaten her territorial integrity by itself. The example of Belgium shows what the public sentiment of Europe can effect in the way of preserving boundaries, and that of Spain shows the effectiveness of unity of language as well as of mountain ranges. Italy is protected by all three. An army and a navy she will of course maintain; but she does not need to overtax herself for this purpose.

The details of the financial situation in Italy are given very imperfectly by Signor Crispi, and his discussion of the taxation of the country is almost unintelligible. It would not be profitable to comment upon what he has to say upon these subjects, but one declaration of his is important if it is correct, viz., that the Triple Alliance imposes no obligation to maintain special armaments. The treaty, he says, is purely defensive, and each nation is to judge for itself as to the size of the force which it will be judicious to maintain. The conclusion is, therefore, unavoidable that the condition of the Italian finances is not due to any international obligations or pressure from other countries, but that the responsibility for it rests entirely with those who have directed the Government of Italy.

STATE OF PARTIES IN FRANCE.

PARIS, June 11, 1892.

SINCE the return of Parliament to work after the Easter recess, the debates have been somewhat dull. Contrary to general expectation, a question addressed to the Government

in reference to the Anarchist arrests fell flat on the attention of the House, and the vote that followed was a foregone victory for the Cabinet. Somehow or other the fighting humor with which both Chambers were inspired before the vacation seems to have melted away while the Deputies were enjoying their holiday; and at present the deliberations, of general or special utility though they be, are certainly without great interest, considered from a political point of view.

Such being the case, it will be wiser to take a look at the relations existing between the various political parties and the country at large. Here is something that merits attention. The tendency which has been now for some time at work in French politics is becoming accentuated every week. The parties of yesterday are non-existent to-day; those of to-day are likely to disappear to-morrow. Such is the order of things at present, and, amid the complicated and seemingly contradictory changes, it would appear that a vital transformation is slowly taking place, and one fraught with vast consequences to the future of the country. All this is for the moment obscure and difficult to analyze. Sufficient, however, can be seen or guessed to furnish at least a partial account of the present situation.

When the Republic was proclaimed in France, the Opposition was composed of a certain number of monarchical parties, classing themselves under three names: Legitimists, or partisans of the Comte de Chambord; Orleanists, who claimed the crown for the Comte de Paris; Bonapartists, who remained faithful to the Empire, and placed their hope in the son of Napoleon III. These anti-republican parties, enrolling themselves under one conservative banner, were numerically stronger than their opponents, and therefore able to hold the Republic in check. But when once it came to forming a definite policy of their own, the differences of opinion between Imperialist and Royalist, and between Royalist and Royalist, made any attempt to resuscitate monarchical institutions vain. The Republic naturally profited by this disunion, and established itself in 1876 by reason of the inability of any other form of government to exist in its place.

By degrees the Republic gained the heart of the country. At succeeding elections the number of Republican votes increased in a steady proportion. For this state of things there was a twofold cause. On the one hand, as has been commonly remarked, the French, with the exception of certain great centres of activity, are conservative of what already exists, dread nothing more than political upheavals, and are consequently disposed to uphold the Government in power, provided only it maintains tranquillity. On the other hand, the rivalries already referred to, which at first redounded to the Republic's advantage, instead of showing signs of diminishing bitterness, increased and multiplied as time went on. Thus, for instance, the death of the Prince Imperial was followed by a quarrel between Prince Jerome Napoleon, the then heir of the Bonapartist claim, and his son Victor, who is now the representative of the dynasty. From that date the Imperialist party was split in two and gradually grew weaker. On the Royalist side the two rival sections were nominally united by the death of one of the claimants, the Comte de Chambord. As luck would have it, however, the Comte de Paris, the surviving claimant, failed to show any of the qualities necessary in a party chief, and above all in one who sought a throne. His action and attitude, on not a few occasions, were characterized by a

deplorable lack of political tact and judgment, and the result was to discourage a large number of his supporters.

The conservative party have endeavored now for some years to organize their forces and to consolidate their cause. The means adopted has been the identification of the interests of religion with those of the monarchy. The weapon used against the Government has been the reiterated accusation that its republicanism is the cause of the oppression of the Church. And in fine every act of the Republican party has been used as a censure, not of particular men or cabinets, but of the institution which they represent. Fixing in particular on certain laws—such, for instance, as the Public Elementary Education Act and the Military Service Obligation Act—the Conservatives laid it down as a principle that every good Catholic ought to do his utmost to bring about a change in laws which secularized the schools, and compelled candidates for the priesthood to gird on the sword. When it is remembered that France is mainly Catholic, and that the clergy possess immense influence in very many parts of the country, the cleverness of the tactics adopted will appear evident. In taking up the cudgels for the Church, the Conservatives obtained a very considerable share of clerical support, and by that means became possessed of a formidable weapon to be used against the Republic. This weapon has just been taken from them. The blow came from a quarter from which it was apparently least to be expected. It was the Pope who suddenly deprived the Conservatives of their rising power and activity, by officially announcing that the opposition the Catholics were manifesting against the Republic could not be sanctioned by him. He added that the republican form of government was as acceptable to the Church as any other form, and that the first duty of a Christian was to submit absolutely and loyally to the government which was established.

Beaten on the political ground, and seeing the religious ground thus summarily closed against them, the Conservatives are discovering that their dream of overturning the Republic is a vain one. There are still a certain number who do not care to avow the truth. Such, for instance, are the students who voted the other day a resolution of unalterable attachment to the Comte de Paris. Such, too, naturally, is Prince Victor Napoleon, who, in a sort of got-up interview, tried a short time ago to show that France must, in spite of herself, come back to the Empire. On the other hand, a section of the Catholics is endeavoring, by means of subtle distinctions, to prove that obedience to the Pope in the absolute is not incompatible with disobedience in the particular—i. e., the present case. Amid this strife of tongues, one thing is especially visible, to wit, the rapid breaking up of the monarchist parties. One by one the leaders are abandoning their whilom commands. M. le Comte de Mun, for instance, formerly a chief among the Royalists, has recently made a public declaration of his submission to the Republic.

Granting, however, that the Republic seems to be at last definitively established, it is by no means so certain that the triumph will be an uninterrupted, peaceful progress. Fresh troubles are appearing already on the horizon; and, for the moment, it is doubtful if they will gather into a storm or melt away in some happier political breeze. It is scarcely necessary to recall to mind the considerable changes which have come over the Republican spirit during the last fifteen years. Without there

being any modification of first principles, the succeeding governments have gradually passed from the Republicanism as understood by M. Thiers to tendencies and sentiments more radical and less conformable to tradition. Men of more advanced views have acceded to power, and the policy of the various cabinets has inclined more and more to the democratic side, less and less to the religious. It is pertinent to ask whether this evolution has been the natural product of the national will. To answer frankly, it is doubtful.

First of all, if comparison is made between the figures of the last few general elections, it will be found that the number of abstentions shows a tendency to increase. It is true that indifference enters largely into the causes which prevent people from recording their vote. But this indifference itself has a motive. In part arising from the national conservative instinct, it is also, in part, the result of a fairly general political scepticism. One government is neither better nor worse than another, is the conclusion which only too many arrive at after a long experience at the polls. Hence, both an unwillingness to vote for a candidate and an equal unwillingness to take the trouble to vote against him. For want of a wider and deeper interest in voting, petty local interests often interfere to decide a parliamentary contest, and the general election may be fairly estimated as lacking that proper national character which it ought to have and to confer on the Legislature.

Of course, this deliberate indifference may break out at any time into an active discontent. No further back than five or six years ago, the Boulangist movement furnished a striking example. Nor does it affect the main argument that Boulangism was a heterogeneous agitation, that the Royalists made use of it to try and restore the monarchy, and that many others were found in its ranks from mere personal ambition. The popularity of Gen. Boulanger, discount made of his individuality, came really from the fact that he represented a wide-felt dissatisfaction against the Government's policy, and his strength was neither more nor less than the temporary concentration in his hands of all the popular discontent. Circumstances so ordered it that the Boulangism of Gen. Boulanger failed to attain its end. But since the discontents which created it are more permanent than the man who personified them, there is a possibility of there being in the near future a Boulangism without Boulanger. Among those hostile to the present Government this idea has already found expression. It wants but a working basis, and an opposition party might quickly organize itself with a reasonable hope of coming into power.

But again, the Conservative party—or rather parties, since for the moment the sections are not properly united—might, in accepting the Republic, wonderfully increase their force. As a matter of fact, to accept the Republic would by no means necessarily be to agree to all its present political doctrines. And in declaring their definitive adhesion to the established rule, they would simply have to make it known that they reserved to themselves the full right to urge their views upon every matter not touching the form of government. Doubtless such an opposition as this, on strictly Constitutional lines, would tell far more against the party in power than an opposition based on revolution, and having to contend against the reluctance of the people. The Liberals and Radicals, thenceforth, deprived of their exclusive claim to the suffrages of the

masses on the ground of law and order, would have to fight against a consolidated Conservative party, that stated a clearly defined policy in opposition to their own; and the Conservatives, profiting, like their neighbors across the Channel, by the shifting opinions and changes of front among their opponents, would succeed sooner or later in seizing the reins of government.

To complete this rapid sketch of the chief political tendencies of the time, notice should be taken of the Socialist movement. But here we are in presence of an agitation so obscurely outlined that intelligent criticism or analysis of it is next to impossible. That the Socialists have succeeded in making themselves a distinct influence in the country it would be futile to deny. To go further than this general confession, and to attempt to estimate what is the Socialist factor in actual legislation, would be to speak without any reliable data. The Socialist party is in no sense at present a homogeneous whole. In addition to several sections, having doctrines peculiar to each, and apparently irreconcilable one with another, there is what might be called an unofficial section obscurely mixed up with the Anarchists, and aiming, like the latter, more at political destruction than at vital reconstruction of the social machine. What is to be the ultimate influence exercised by these incongruous, explosive elements on the main body of the working classes? What effect will they ultimately produce on the general political life of the country? For the moment no reply can be given to these questions; and so long as this is the case, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to read accurately the signs of the times.

To sum up, it appears that in spite of the rout of the Royalists and Imperialists—a rout brought on partly by accidental circumstances, partly by their own divisions and short-sightedness—the Republic is still menaced by a slumbering dissatisfaction in the country, which may at any time become active. Further, it appears that the Royalists and Imperialists have a very good chance of transforming themselves into a legitimate opposition and of snatching the coveted power and leadership from the hands of the present possessors. The struggle on both sides is rendered more doubtful by the presence of an unknown factor—the Socialist vote. What will be the outcome? No one at present can say. S.

Correspondence.

THE PRESIDENCY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The lists are cleared, the champions marshalled, and the conflict of four months is about to begin. Foreigners look upon it with unmingled horror. They see in it only uproar and turmoil, disturbance of business and enormous outlay of money, brass-bands and torch-light processions, endless speechmaking, mud-throwing, slander, and political intrigue, and all for no definite purpose whatever. It seems a spectacle to excite only disgust and contempt. They are welcome to their opinion. We believe it to be the grandest event in the world, not merely from a sentimental point of view, but for practical, homely, every-day value; that it is well worth every particle of its cost, whether in time or money.

Once in four years the whole people of the United States turn aside from their money-getting and their personal cares and anxieties to a question of politics, aside from themselves

and yet of common interest to them all. In the cabin of the laborer, in the single room of the city tenement, in the palace of the millionaire, the morning paper which reports progress causes every pulse to beat in unison, and moves in every breast the old feeling, *Civis Romanus sum*. The man from Maine who visits Louisiana, the Oregonian sojourning in Florida, will meet at every street corner those with whom he can exchange warm sympathy and interest, not in reverence for a sovereign whose claim rests solely upon being born in a particular family, mostly kept up by the intermarriage of cousins, but as co-workers, at least in theory and however imperfectly the machinery may work, in the choice of their own Chief Magistrate.

The German and French armies are assembled every year at an immense cost, and for no present purpose, simply to keep them in the highest state of efficiency. We, too, have our "autumn manoeuvres," not for the purpose of ultimate slaughter and destruction, but in training to give expression to the national will, and to quiet and peaceful submission to the outcome of a vote under the conditions prescribed by law. If we went on for a century with such elections, apparently settling nothing, yet if in one crisis like the civil war it gave us an Abraham Lincoln, the process would have paid for itself a hundred times over.

Among the proofs of wisdom which appear almost more than human in that wonderful instrument the Federal Constitution, not the least is in the fact that it places the chief executive power in the hands of a single President, elected, as it results in practice, directly by the people. It might have intrusted this power to a committee of three or more persons, which would have opened a Pandora's box of political intrigue and trading, and would have destroyed that personal enthusiasm which is the only effective instrument for moving multitudes. It might have made that President or that committee elective by Congress, in which case either would have represented the will of Congress and not the will of the nation, which the experience of the century is showing more and more to be totally different things. It did give us that, like which there is nothing else in the world, and which contains untold possibilities for the future.

How important it is is shown by the two recent conventions. Perhaps there have been none in which meaner and more selfish intrigues were aiming to control the nominations, yet they were swept away like reeds; and necessity, for any chance of success with the people, compelled the prompt nomination of at least the two most respectable candidates who were available. It is hardly entering upon party politics to say that there is in the century of our history hardly a case of more complete poetic justice than the pulverization of Mr. Blaine.

What is the reason of the certainly well-grounded complaint of foreigners that our Presidential elections have no meaning? The simple one is that, having elected a chief magistrate, we proceed to tie his hands and feet. Consider for a moment that this man, elected, and the only one elected, by sixty millions of people, has no direct power over legislation or financial policy, and but very little over administration, which is the outcome of both. Neither of himself nor by any of his chosen officials, has he any voice in shaping the measures of government. That is left to four hundred local representatives, any one of

whom has more power in the matter than the President himself, unless the latter chooses to compete in the intrigues of the lobby. Mr. Cleveland probably owes his nomination, and will owe his election, as much as anything to his bold and ringing message on the tariff, and will probably follow it up with another. But, after all, it is only a general expression of opinion, endorsed, no doubt, by the country, but which does nothing towards settling the details upon which the whole question turns. The lobby will continue to govern the country after as before, and so this superb machinery of the Presidency is brought to naught, at least in its objective working, by the grasping ambition of Congress, which hugs its own anarchy and refuses to submit to leaders.

Imagine a President who should address a message not to Congress but to the country, saying to the people in substance: "You have sent me here upon a policy of tariff reform. It is impossible for me to do anything about the matter unless I am authorized to place before Congress a definite measure embodying your and my opinions in detail, and can have an opportunity, through the Secretary of the Treasury, of explaining and defending it before the country. Will you require Congress to receive such a measure?"

How long would it be before that body received a mandate to which it would be compelled to yield? G. B.

Boston, June 25, 1892.

THE RUSSIAN PROFESSORSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There is a legitimate question: What is the province of a professor of foreign languages? If it is to inculcate accurate pronunciation, then by all means have only native incumbents. But there is something far more important than that: it is the ability to teach and inspire.

It is the experience of many graduates of colleges that foreign tutors and professors, no matter how learned they may have been, failed in appreciating what their students required. Not having had to learn the language themselves, they could not supply the help which one "not to the manner born" would almost instinctively afford. Who would not prefer to study German, French, Italian, or Spanish with men like Longfellow or Lowell than with any foreign professors that could be named? Students who expect to learn to speak a foreign language must go elsewhere than to the class-room.

Even were a Russian imported to act as professor in some American university, there would be no absolute security that he would be able accurately to pronounce Polish, Bohemian, Wendish, and all the other dialects of Slavonic. If he came from Kieff, he might even pronounce Russian with a Little Russian accent! There would be a large chance, moreover, that he would not understand American wants, and would make as ghastly a failure as Prof. Ko made at Harvard in teaching Chinese.

There is still another point. A professor of Russian would not be likely to be overrun with pupils. A large part of his time would be naturally given to study and research. To any one who has looked into the matter there offer many inviting fields of study—philology, art, poetry—which a man with the leisure granted by such a position might exploit. Would not an American who had been educated for several years in Russia be better

qualified to do good work in these branches than a Russian who would be disqualified from writing idiomatic English?

There is no occasion for any jealousy in the matter. There is room for a dozen to work: the more the merrier. It would be interesting, for instance, if two universities should establish chairs of Russian, one filled by a native, the other by such a man, for instance, as the Hon. Jeremiah Curtin, who not only speaks Russian almost like a native, but is acquainted with Polish and many dialects besides of the noble Slavonic language. It would then be soon easy to see which would be the most successful in attracting students or in furnishing the English-speaking world with a knowledge of the sealed books of the East.

Enthusiasm, good temper, and the genius of teaching are more important than a mere name.

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE.

BOSTON, June 21, 1892.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of June 16 there is to be found a discussion by Miss Isabel F. Hapgood on the Russian professorship. I heartily concur with her in advising a careful selection of a professor of Russian; but I must guard the readers of the *Nation* against an erroneous impression which the exalted requirements of the article must produce. A professor of Russian must, above all, be conversant with the Russian language and literature; for the rest, he need possess only a philological and not necessarily a linguistic knowledge of the other Slavic tongues. Do we ask of a professor of German that he should speak or even read Icelandic, Swedish, Anglo-Saxon, Dutch, etc.? Of course not. I can think of only one professor, at a European university who speaks fluently three Slavic languages, and that is the great philologist, Prof. Miklositch of Vienna; in fact, the seat of comparative Slavic philology is not in Russia, but in Austria. Miss Hapgood says that the professor in question ought to know, among other things, Serbian, Croatian, and Montenegrin. Now Miss Hapgood ought to know that Montenegrin is a mere dialectic form of the Serbian, and that Croatian is treated by nearly all philologists as one with Serbian. One might with equal propriety demand that a professor of German should speak English, American English, and Tennessee English. Further, a knowledge of the Russian dialects is said to be needed. I confess I am at a loss in trying to define such dialects, as the Russian is almost free from dialectic differences. The Ruthenian is, indeed, a distinct dialect, but the study of it is discouraged in Russia for political reasons.

The Russian language is not such a bugbear as some would like to make it; it is scarcely more difficult than Greek. The verb offers no more difficulties than the Hebrew verb, and I have known foreigners who have made very creditable progress in it. There is a chair of Russian at the University of Oxford, ably filled by Prof. Morfill, and I see no reason why an American university could not be successful in establishing a chair for Slavic languages.

L. S. WIENER
(A Russian).

KANSAS CITY, Mo., June 24, 1892.

Notes.

MR. R. L. GARNER, who will shortly visit Africa for the purpose of studying in the open the language of apes, will first bring out,

through Charles L. Webster & Co., a work embodying his researches on 'The Speech of Monkeys' in confinement, which have already been reported in divers periodicals.

'German and English Sounds,' by C. H. Grandgent, illustrated with diagrams, is in the press of Ginn & Co., Boston.

A new and extensively revised edition of Bryce's 'American Commonwealth' will in no long time be issued by Macmillan & Co. It will, of course, be copyrighted in America.

A 'Life of Ethan Allen,' by the late Henry Hall, will be published at once by D. Appleton & Co.

'A History of Peru,' by Clements R. Markham, will introduce the series on the Latin-American Republics projected by Charles H. Sergel & Co.

A work on novel lines, for schools and for the general reader, is 'England and Its Rulers,' by H. Pomeroy Brewster and Geo. H. Humphrey, shortly to be issued by S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago, who also announce 'Columbus: An Epic Poem,' by Samuel Jefferson, and 'A Phrase Book of Eclectic Shorthand,' by J. G. Cross.

Roberts Bros. send us two more volumes of their very taking edition of Jane Austen, viz., 'Mansfield Park.' From Harper & Bros. we have the eighth edition of Mr. Laurence Hutton's 'Literary Landmarks of London,' revised in the plates and also supplemented with notes, many of them recording the demolition of old buildings since the first appearance of this work, and one citing Prof. Lounsbury's destructive comments on the Chaucer legends recorded in the text. The publishers have inserted a number of full-page portraits, of varied excellence, but in the sum an enhancement of the value of the work. Macmillan & Co. have brought out still another reprint of the first editions of Dickens's novels, this time of 'Nicholas Nickleby,' with the usual historical and bibliographical introduction by the younger Dickens, with Phiz's illustrations, and with copies of lithographic stage pictures from the dramatization of the story. We can but repeat that the cheapness of this series, its excellent typography, and the editorial apparatus should insure it a very wide popularity. The Clarendon Press has very properly undertaken a second edition of the late Mark Pattison's 'Isaac Casaubon,' the first (published by the Messrs. Longman) being out of print. We judged the work, on its appearance, "a model of biography," and it has been bettered in sundry details with the aid of manuscript additions and corrections left by the author, and by the suggestions of friends. The American publishers are Macmillan & Co.

The methods of building construction in iron and steel are well shown in the second volume of Berg's 'Safe Building' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.), the first volume of which we noticed when it appeared some years ago. Like the first, this is made up of articles which were printed in the *American Architect*. It covers ground on which no one can venture a step in practice without special knowledge, and which Mr. Berg had treated but slightly before; consequently he has followed out his subject with minuteness, giving most attention to riveted work, which preponderates in modern building because of its ease of construction, and which has its peculiar risks. The same care and thoroughness that gave value to the former volume appear in this.

For the seventeenth time MM. Édouard Noël and Edmond Stoullig have sent forth their year-book of music and the drama in Paris, *Les Annales du Théâtre et de la Mu-*

sique (Paris: Charpentier; New York: F. W. Christern). As on former occasions, they have asked some celebrity of the dramatic or musical world to prepare a preface, this year M. Gustave Larroumet, one of the most learned and acute of French dramatic critics. He devotes himself to a defence of Eugène Scribe, in the course of which he incidentally sets forth more than one of the underlying principles of the dramatic art. Confessing frankly Scribe's deficiencies as a man of letters, he exhibits Scribe's surpassing skill as a man of the theatre. The book which this brilliant paper precedes resembles its predecessors, for as a whole the year 1891 was much like the two or three years just before it; but that the French theatre is alive and vigorous, these four hundred solid pages testify abundantly.

The meeting of the American Institute of Mining Engineers often affords opportunity for the preparation of instructive handbooks. The most recent of these is the 'Guide-book of Baltimore,' for the meeting of last February. The novel element of the book is a contoured map of the region around Baltimore, colored for the geological formations, being a reproduction of one of the first sheets thus prepared by the National Geological Survey. The field-work required for it was done by Prof. G. H. Williams of Johns Hopkins University and N. H. Darton of the Survey. This is hardly a matter of popular interest, as the structure of the region is complicated; but geologists must welcome the publication of such a map as giving good promise of what may be expected for the country at large when the many sheets that are to follow it come to be issued with frequency.

Mr. Henry Gannett's paper on "The Mother Maps of the United States" has been reprinted from the *National Geographic Magazine* (Washington). It briefly enumerates the several Government, State, and private surveys which have furnished the material for original maps, and then indicates what portion of the country can be mapped on the scale of 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16 miles to an inch, respectively. On the largest scale named only four States can be mapped, namely, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. The scale of two miles to an inch is that on which the Geological Survey is systematically at work, and a scattered area of 460,000 square miles, or from a fifth to a sixth of the whole country, has thus been mapped. Omitting Alaska, which is yet in the stage of exploration, all but about 225,000 square miles of the United States can be mapped on a scale of sixteen miles to an inch—the scale adopted by the Geographic Congress for mapping the whole earth. Mr. Gannett summarizes his data in tabular form, and also graphically on a colored map. It is noticeable how extensively the Appalachian region from the Pennsylvania line southward has been mapped by the Geological Survey, for obvious material reasons.

From the same magazine has been extracted Mr. Harry Fielding Reid's "Studies of Muir Glacier, Alaska," the fruit of an expedition in 1890 prompted by Prof. Wright's description of the glacier in his 'Ice Age in North America.' "Glacier Bay offers the luxury of exploration," says Mr. Reid, owing to its being in weekly communication with the rest of the world by steamship service. A hundred years ago he thinks it might have been in large part filled with ice from the several glaciers, which are now rapidly retreating—Muir Glacier at the rate of a mile in seven years. Mr. Reid's map will be invaluable for noting future changes. His paper, which is written in a

popular style and is interesting reading, is accompanied by numerous striking photographic views of mountain, ice-stream, and buried forest.

The Boston municipal authorities have printed, forty years after date, the 4th of July oration delivered before their predecessors in 1852 by the Rev. Thomas Starr King. The theme, "The Organization of Liberty on the Western Continent," was actually handled without an allusion to slavery, and this makes the oration a real curiosity to-day. Mr. King's subsequent transplanting to the Pacific Coast had, as is well known, important effects in preserving that section to the Union on the outbreak of the slaveholders' rebellion. The pamphlet may be had of Alvah H. Peters, City Messenger, at the Boston City Hall, on application from libraries and collectors.

The June number of the *Inland Printer* (Chicago) contains a report of the banquet given by their employees to the proprietors of the De Vinne Press, on April 30, in acknowledgment of the voluntary profit-sharing allowed upon the business of the past year. The spectacle is not a pleasing one to trade unions; but no one can read Mr. Theodore L. De Vinne's words of honest tribute to his associates and frank discussion of labor controversies without being thankful that here is an establishment where the walking delegate has no occupation, though he must often look through the grille with longing to disturb the happiness within.

Mr. F. Gutekunst, Philadelphia, sends us an imperial panel photograph of Prof. Richard T. Ely of Johns Hopkins University, and an equally speaking but smaller likeness of the late Father Mollinger of faith-cure notoriety.

—In *La Réforme Sociale* for June 1, M. Albert Bordeaux, a mining engineer resident in Bosnia, has an interesting article on the condition of that country under Austrian domination. By the treaty of Berlin, of July 13, 1878, Bosnia, which had been for four centuries one of the provinces of the Ottoman Empire, passed, together with Herzegovina, under the Austrian rule, only a nominal overlordship being left to Turkey. According to M. Bordeaux, the change has been an unmixed benefit, and there is promise of much greater improvement in the future. At the time of the Turkish conquest, the feudal landlords abandoned the Christian faith and became Moslems in order to preserve their estates and privileges, while the tillers of the soil remained Christians and were, in time, reduced to the lowest social stage. Their methods of agriculture were of the most primitive description, while, at the same time, they groaned under a crushing burden of taxation and disqualification. Attempts at reform, principally by abolishing feudal conditions, were made by the Turkish Government in 1859, but were never sincerely enforced by the local authorities, and resulted in no amelioration of the lot of the masses. Even during the first four years of the Austrian domination, the improvement was not perceptible. Since the rising of 1882, however, the Austrian Government has made remarkable progress in organizing the administration of justice on an equitable basis, in rendering life and property secure, in making taxes payable in money instead of in kind, in facilitating communication by building roads (the labor being performed by soldiers), in suppressing brigandage; in short, in converting a feudal State into a modern community. M. Bordeaux goes into some detail in describing the moral improvement in matters pertaining to religion and popular education, and antici-

pates that much more will be accomplished in the near future. He says that the House of Austria is becoming an Eastern Power, having already more Slavic subjects than it has subjects of any other nationality. The figures as he gives them are: 17,500,000 Slavs, as against 6,000,000 Magyars, 10,000,000 Germans, and 3,600,000 Latins. It should not be forgotten, however, that, for the present at least, the Magyars hold the political balance of power.

—The June Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society opens with the annual address of Sir M. E. Grant Duff, in which he dwelt especially upon the need of a greater attention to the study of geography in the schools and universities. In order to obtain the necessary time, he advocates the giving up of Greek and Latin composition "as a piece of regular school business," saying that "this bears much the same relation to serious intellectual pursuits as does to the proper works and ways of an intelligent dog the art of jumping through a hoop filled with paper, or that of balancing on his nose a piece of biscuit till he is told that it is 'paid for.'" This is followed by an account of a journey in central Peru by Mr. A. Ross, made with a view to reporting upon its suitability to tropical agriculture. An interesting discussion took place when the paper was read before the Society, in the course of which the Consul-General of Peru claimed that in the northern department of Piura, where it rains once in seven years, cotton yields "two crops, maize four crops, potatoes three crops, coffee and tobacco two crops, a year, and in addition to the quantity you have the quality." Lord Donoughmore referred to the fact that on the sugar plantations of the coast, which is practically rainless, where there is a system of artificial irrigation, so far as sugar cultivation goes you are independent. "You can put your water on the fields when you like and take it off when you like, and plant in any month of the year, reap in any month of the year, and keep your mill going all the year round." Mr. Clements R. Markham dwelt especially on the excellence and value of the products of the country, *e. g.*, rubber and the Peruvian bark, which sells for twice as much as Indian bark. He paid a high tribute to the capacity of the Incas Indians, who are among the most skilful shepherds and farmers the world has ever seen. After centuries of patient and skilful care they domesticated the alpaca, "producing the most silky fleeces that are known." They developed the potato, and have brought maize to such perfection that "one cob of Cuzco-maize is equal to five or six of any other kind." And lately they have produced the coca, whose cultivation and curing requires the utmost care and skill. What the country most needs is a larger agricultural population, and more and better roads communicating both with the Pacific Coast and with the navigable affluents of the Amazons. Mr. Markham also contributes a highly appreciative and well-deserved tribute to the late Prof. E. A. Freeman, with especial relation to his services to geography.

—In 'Tanganyika' (London: E. Stanford), Mr. E. C. Hore gives an account of eleven years of pioneer missionary work in Central Africa. A sailor by profession, he devotes himself wholly to descriptions of the practical side of missionary life, the long journeys through the wilderness, the founding of stations, intercourse with the natives, and voyages upon the great lake which he was the first to explore thoroughly. His book is marked by the frank hopeful-

ness characteristic of men of his calling, as well as by the appreciation of what is good in his fellows. The interior natives, for instance, are "neither evil nor degraded," and there is a cordial recognition of the numerous services of the Arabs to the mission, and especially of the much decried Tippu Tib. The few references to the Roman Catholics who, coming later here as in Uganda, must be regarded as intruders, show a kindly feeling very different from that which unfortunately now prevails in the latter kingdom. There is an interesting chapter on Lake Tanganyika or "mixture," in which it is shown to be the "heart of Africa," geographically, politically, and ethnographically. In its surrounding heights are the sources of three of the four great continental rivers, the Nile, the Congo, and the Zambesi. Its shores are not only the meeting-point of the possessions of Great Britain, Germany, and the Congo Free State, but they are the home of twelve tribes, the typical representatives of the aboriginal African races. From Mr. Hore's story we should conclude that the work of the mission has been largely of a civilizing and educating, rather than of a distinctively religious, character. Among other things a steamer, fifty-four feet long, has been transported with immense pains over nearly a thousand miles of roadless wilderness, and successfully launched upon the lake, where it is used in the service of white and black alike.

—Among the "Études Romanes" dedicated by his pupils to Gaston Paris on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his *doctorat ès lettres*, was one by Alexandre Beljame on the curious subject of the pronunciation of the name of John Law, the financier of the South Sea Bubble. "We write it *Law*," says Prof. Beljame, "and we pronounce it *Lass*," though the *aw* sound presents no difficulty to the French vocal organs, and has its equivalent in *mort*, *sort*, *dort*, *tort*, etc. Saint-Simon records the change to "Las," without offering any other explanation than Law's greater notoriety at the time. Louis Moland, the editor of Voltaire, surmised that the possessive "Law's" was so often heard from his English financial associates speaking of his "system" that the genitive was finally mistaken for a nominative. M. Beljame shows that the pronunciation was in vogue in France before the "system" was advertised; and as the form "Law" is wanting in the various documentary spellings, he concludes that the name was *heard* before it was read. His researches were directed aright by a letter of Steele's addressed "To Mr. John Laws at Paris, Aug. 12, 1719," and he then discovered this form in several places, in manuscript and in print, sometimes accompanied by the ordinary form. Both usages, he is able to prove, prevailed in Law's time. The legal form was "Law," as is evidenced by the birth-register of the financier, and by his invariable signature without the *s*. This suffix, in a great many instances in England, furnishes doublets like Adam and Adams, Andrew and Andrews, Brook and Brooks, Edward and Edwards, etc., and denotes a true genitive signifying "son of," so that "*Laws* is equivalent to *Lawson*." M. Beljame closes his agreeable little monograph by justifying the retention of the French pronunciation *Lass*, especially now that the reason of it is apparent. As a survival of an old Scotch (rather than English) pronunciation, he likens it to the English *Belvoir* for Belvoir, "*souvenir d'une ancienne prononciation française*." The pamphlet bears the imprint of Émile Bouillon, Paris.

—Franz Liszt, in his delightful essay on Robert Franz (now incorporated in his 'Gesammelte Schriften,' vol. iv., pp. 207-244), refers to the remarkable fact that America anticipated Europe in the formation of a circle devoted to the songs of Franz—Schubert's greatest successor. This honor was won for America chiefly through the devotion of the late Otto Dresel, at one time Boston's leading pianist. He was a personal friend and enthusiastic admirer of Franz, whom he assisted in the task of writing additional accompaniments to Bach and Handel scores. His pianoforte score of the "Messiah" is based on Franz's edition, and is the best in the market. Of original works Dresel did not compose many, the best being a collection of songs—'Lieder-Album'—just issued by Breitkopf & Härtel (Leipzig and New York). This album includes twenty songs, with German and English words in each case; and for Americans there is this advantage, that some of the *Lieder* were composed to English words. Mr. Dresel's songs cannot be too highly commended to amateurs and professionals. They betray the influence of Franz so strongly that one might often fancy he was listening to a new song by that immortal composer; just as Franz himself constantly suggests Bach in his best mood. Note, for instance, how Dresel's exquisite "O Listen, My Darling," suggests Franz's "Wonne der Wehmuth." There are many other jewels in the collection. Breitkopf & Härtel have also sent us a collection of five "Liebeslieder," by Heinrich Zöllner, praise of which must, however, be pitched in a much lower key. Zöllner is not happy in his modulations.

GEORGE MASON.—II.

The Life of George Mason, 1725-1792. By Kate Mason Rowland. Including his Speeches, Public Papers, and Correspondence. With an introduction by Gen. Fitzhugh Lee. 2 vols. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1892.

WE have seen that, in many of his political opinions, George Mason was far in advance of the common mind among his contemporaries. He had the large discourse of reason which looks before and after. A man of thrift and a slaveholder, he had philosophic insight to see that slavery was as bad in economics as in ethics. He began his economical agitation against slavery as early as 1765, when, in the preface to "a scheme for replevying goods under distress," he expounded the policy of encouraging the importation of free people and discouraging that of slaves. His denunciation of the effect which slavery had on social life and manners was persistent, running as it does through his writings and speeches from 1765 to 1788; and it was so vehement that Miss Rowland feels called to explain to us that George Mason was "no abolitionist." Certainly he was no abolitionist, but John Wesley never said harder things against slavery. Miss Rowland suggests, by way of exception to the sweeping generality of his statements, that he offered in his own courtly person a contradiction of his thesis that "slavery produces the most pernicious effect on manners." If, as Jefferson said, he sometimes dashed his speeches with "cynicism," it may have been a disdain which sprang from a lofty sense of his own personal honor, rather than from contempt for others. If, as Madison thought, the chafe and friction of "little circumstances" in the Federal Convention, arising from impatience of cross opinions in debate, "conspired to whet his acrimony" against the Con-

stitution, it is certain that he proved the sincerity of his opinions as much by the sacrifices he made for them as by the earnestness with which he maintained them.

There are a few things in which the conduct of Mason in the Federal Convention seems scarcely consistent with his general character and antecedents, except on the suspicion that he may have sometimes played the part of a *Frondeur*, and put himself in opposition for opposition's sake. He moved to strike out the clause prohibiting bills of attainder and ex-post-facto laws. He thought bills of attainder had saved the British Constitution! He was unwilling to see the hands of Congress tied against the passage of legal-tender laws, though, as passed by the States, he held them to be the offspring of delusion or fraud. He favored an express provision for the Congressional enactment of sumptuary laws, under color of which the Federal Legislature might have controlled the dress and food of every man, woman, and child in the United States. It would seem that the power of paternalism could no further go. Yet this tribune of the people supposed himself to be the special champion of personal liberty and State rights.

George Mason took little part in public affairs after the ratification of the Constitution. He was appointed to the Senate of the United States after the death of Grayson, but he refused to serve. He naturally drifted away from Washington after the sharp cleavage of their opinions on the subject of the Constitution. They did not come to an open rupture of personal relations, but Washington now called him a "quondam friend." It was natural that as a soured patriot he should soon despair of the republic. In a letter to Jefferson in the early part of 1791, after less than two years of Federalism under the Administration of Washington, he expressed the opinion that there was even then "a particular circumstance, little attended to, which was constantly sapping the republicanism of the United States." Jefferson wrote to ask what this "particular circumstance" was, and as the reply of Mason is lost, Miss Rowland thinks that "for us there is no answer to the query," though she suspects that Mason was hinting dispraise of the Judiciary Act of 1789. It seems to us that the query can be easily answered by a reference to the writings and speeches of Mason as here preserved for us by his accomplished biographer. The "particular circumstance" to which he adverted as being "little attended to," could not have been the Judiciary Act, for that "abomination" of Federalism was constantly looming in the eyes of the Virginian Republicans. We cannot doubt that what seemed to Mason at that moment so menacing to republican simplicity in the United States, was the reëligibility and the actual reflection of executive and legislative officers alike, under the Federal and the State Governments, so far as opportunity had offered under the new régime. When the section in the Constitution relating to the office and duties of the Federal executive came up for discussion in the Virginia Convention of 1788, Mason used in that body the identical phrase which he now used in writing to Jefferson, and it was to this vice of Presidential reëligibility that he pointed as opening a sap and mine under the very monuments of republicanism. He said: "There is not a more important article in the Constitution than this [the section relating to the office of the President]: the great fundamental principle of responsibility in republicanism is here sapped. The President is elected without rotation. . . . Nothing is so essen-

tial to the preservation of republican government as a periodical rotation. . . . It is a great defect in the Senate that they are not ineligible at the end of six years."

This maxim of republicanism was so fundamental in the political dogmatics of George Mason that when the Fairfax Military Company, "composed entirely of gentlemen," was organized at the outbreak of the Revolution, he insisted that all its officers, with the exception of its captain (George Washington), should be newly elected every year. In a constitution drawn up by him for the government of the company, he propounded the following as a universal doctrine: "Wherever any military establishment, or authority, is not by some certain mode of rotation dissolved and blended with the mass from which it was taken, inevitable destruction to the State follows." In the Federal Convention he held it as "an essential point for the preservation of the rights of the people—as the very palladium of civil liberty—that the great officers of state, and particularly the executive, should at fixed periods return to that mass from which they were at first taken." In the Virginia Convention he did but strike the same keynote with a shriller tone, and in view of the fact that all his trumpet-calls had passed unheeded by the American people, he now sounded his alarm in the ears of Jefferson. Jefferson had been absent in Europe while Mason was inveighing against the Constitution. How sincerely Jefferson sympathized with him in this opinion is now known to us all. That George Mason should have mourned in 1791 that this "particular circumstance" was so "little attended to," is easily explained when we remember that in spite of the iteration with which he pressed it, and in spite of the embodiment which he procured for it in the proposition of amendments to the Constitution as made by the Virginia Convention, only two other States could be brought to take any notice of this peril.

We observe that Miss Rowland dismisses as a fable the newspaper story that George Mason, on passing through the town of Alexandria (Va.) on his return from the Philadelphia Convention in 1887, was waited upon by the Mayor and corporation with a notification that "they did not come to return him their thanks for his conduct in refusing to sign the Federal Constitution, but to express their abhorrence of it," and with the advice that he should withdraw from the town within an hour, as they could not answer for his safety from an enraged populace. Miss Rowland thinks that the story cannot be true, because George Mason was too much respected by the Mayor and corporation of Alexandria to have received any such treatment, and because neither Gen. Washington nor Mason himself makes any allusion to the alleged incident. But it seems to us, without venturing any positive opinion in the premises, that the "probabilities" of the story are to be measured not so much by the respect in which the Alexandrians had once undoubtedly held the statesman of Gunston Hall, as by the admiring reverence they cherished for Gen. Washington, and by the resentment they were likely to feel at the reflection on him implied in Mason's harsh denunciation of the document which Washington was known to advocate. The county of Fairfax, in which Washington and Mason resided, elected Federalists to the Convention, and Mason, as a candidate for the Convention, was compelled to look for his election to another county than that in which he lived. It is true that Washington makes no distinct reference to such an incident, but he does tell

us that Mason's conduct in the Federal Convention was "reprobated" in his neighborhood ("in this country"), and Mr. Madison recites in a letter to Jefferson about this time that Mason's conduct had given "great umbrage in the County of Fairfax, and particularly in the town of Alexandria." This latter statement shows that, according to Madison's information, there had been some particular manifestation of "unpleasantness" on the part of that town. And if there had been no demonstration of Mason's unpopularity in Alexandria in 1787 and 1788, how does Miss Rowland account for the genesis of the story which she recounts on page 210 in her second volume, and which sounds like an echo of the earlier legend? She doubtless knows that the earlier story had a wide dissemination in the newspaper press of the time, and is not found alone in the journal which she cites. The incident, whether true or false, has no value whatsoever for its bearing on the real greatness of Mason, but it may have an interest as showing the "pillar of cloud" which overhung the steps of "the fathers" in this transition epoch of the republic. It is in this sense alone that the story is worthy of any special wonder.

We are pleased to find that the acute mind of George Mason was early puzzled by the same problem in social and political dynamics to which we have more than once called the attention of our readers, without taking time for its formal discussion. We refer to the question why it was that a social democracy in New England produced the most inveterate type of aristocratic politics ever known in our country, and why it was that a social aristocracy in Virginia produced a democratic order of Federal politics at the very beginning of our history under the Constitution. After his first contact with the delegates composing the Federal Convention, he writes as follows to one of his sons under date of May 20, 1787:

"What is a very extraordinary phenomenon, we are likely to find the Republicans on this occasion issue from the Southern and Middle States and the anti-Republicans from the Eastern. However extraordinary this may at first seem, it may, I think, be accounted for from a very common and natural impulse of the human mind. Men disappointed in expectations too hastily and sanguinely formed, tired and disgusted with the unexpected evils they have experienced, and anxious to remove them as far as possible, are very apt to run into the opposite extreme; and the people of the Eastern States, setting out with more republican principles, have consequently been more disappointed than we have been."

This solution is drawn simply from a view of facts lying on the surface of recent events, and, besides being in itself, as it seems to us, a hasty and insufficient induction, was perhaps confirmed in Mason's mind by the outgivings of his sympathetic friend and political confederate, Elbridge Gerry. Certain it is that we find Gerry confessing, in the confidence of the Federal Convention debates (as recorded by Madison), that he had at one time "been too republican," but that he had been taught by experience (referring, we presume, to the Shays rebellion) "the danger of the levelling spirit." In fact, we must look much deeper than all this for any adequate explanation of such a curious double antithesis in our national politics. Mason's and Gerry's solution answers only one branch of the compound problem, and leaves unexplained the still more puzzling fact that it was the Southern social system which, in spite of its aristocratic structure, produced "Jeffersonian simplicity" and "Jacksonian vulgarity," as they were called on a notable occasion. We have our views on this

subject, but their discussion here would lead us too far afield at the heel of this review.

Miss Rowland certainly does not expect that all her readers will concur with her when she says that the Virginia Convention, by the form under which it ratified the Constitution, "declared the right of secession, as a correlative of accession, for all the thirteen sovereignties." It is known that the Convention, in its formula of ratification, "declared and made known, in the name and in the behalf of the people of Virginia, that the powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the people of the United States, be resumed by them whenever the same shall be perverted to their injury or oppression." From the fact that the word "people," as here used, must be taken, with Mr. Madison, to mean "not the people as composing one great body, but the people as composing thirteen sovereignties," Miss Rowland infers that the right of separate State secession is involved in the formula not only as a necessary implication, but as being expressed "in unmistakable terms." That Miss Rowland should make this deduction for all it may be worth in political hermeneutics, or that she should draw it *arguendo*, as the lawyers say, seems to us quite legitimate in what John Taylor of Caroline would call "construction construed"; but, as a matter of cold history, this interpretation of the formula was distinctly repudiated at the time the formula was adopted. We have the express statement of Madison to this effect—a statement not made in after years, when South Carolina politicians were trying to read this interpretation between the lines of the formula, but a statement made by Madison at a date when the ink with which the formula was written had hardly had time to grow dry. Madison, it is known, immediately after the Virginia Convention had adjourned, hastened to New York, and there resumed his seat in the Continental Congress. Alexander Hamilton, sore bested at Poughkeepsie in his battle for the Constitution against an overwhelming anti-Federalist majority in the New York Convention, wrote to Madison on the 19th of July, 1788, to ask if it would not be possible to ratify the Constitution "with the reservation of a right to recede, in case our [the New York] amendments have not been decided upon . . . within a certain number of years." Madison immediately replied that "the idea of reserving the right to withdraw had been started at Richmond," in the convention called to sit on the Constitution, and had been "abandoned as worse than rejection." "The Constitution," he added, "requires an adoption *in toto* and forever. It has been so adopted by the other States. An adoption for a limited time would be as defective as an adoption of some of the articles only." Such was the understanding alike of the friends and of the enemies of the Constitution in 1788. It was this understanding which inspired its friends to work so earnestly for its ratification. It was this understanding which inspired its enemies to work so earnestly against its ratification. "The battle of giants" in the Virginia Convention is made unintelligible on any other theory, and no other theory was ever propounded, so far as we are advised, until the exigencies of the Nullification controversy, as raised by South Carolina, seemed to call for the extremest doctrine of reserved rights in the individual "sovereignties." Madison, we know, always denied that this doctrine could be found in the "Resolutions of '98," with all the ambiguities which may be justly laid on their heads.

It was inevitable that there should be an occasional slip of the pen in a work so voluminous as that to which Miss Rowland has set her hand. Everybody sees that it is a mere slip of the pen when Councillor Carter of Nomini, so called because he was a member of the Governor's Council, is designated as "Counsellor Carter," on p. 90 in the first volume, or as when the name of John Dickinson of Pennsylvania is sometimes miswritten "Dickerson." We are a little surprised at the free use made of 'Yates's Minutes' of the Federal Convention, without any intimation, so far as we can recall, that their accuracy has been impeached at so many points as to make them practically valueless in disputed questions.

BOOKS ABOUT THE STAGE.

Practical Play-Writing and the Cost of Production. By Alfred C. Calmoun. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

Les Recettes de Cuisine Théâtrales de M. Sésosthène Rabichon. Par Auguste Germain. Paris: Ernest Kolb; New York: F. W. Christern.

A Book of Burlesque. By W. Davenport Adams. [The Whitefriars Library of Wit and Humor.] London: Henry & Co.

Occasional Addresses. Collected by Laurence Hutton and William Carey. New York: The Dunlap Society.

Choses et Gens de Théâtre. Par Paul Ginisty. Paris: Didier; New York: F. W. Christern.

Études d'Histoire et de Critique Dramatiques. Par Gustave Larroumet. Paris: Hachette; New York: F. W. Christern.

MR. WM. DAVENPORT ADAMS contributes a preface to 'Practical Play-Writing,' from which we learn that the author, Mr. A. C. Calmoun, is an actor who has written and produced many plays. "Though he has secured most popular approval as a writer of plays written in verse and dealing with poetic motifs, he has had much practice in various dramatic methods, and has always devoted much attention to dramatic technique." One of his more or less poetic plays was acted a few years ago by Miss Ellen Terry; it was called "The Amber Heart." None of them has as yet been acted in the United States, so far as we know. His little paper on practical play-writing was written to be read at the Play-Goers' Club and also at Prof. Herkomer's School of Art at Bushey. It is scarcely more successful in showing the novice how to write a play than was Prof. Hennequin's elaborate treatise that we reviewed a year or two ago. It is less successful than the rather vulgar book which was reprinted from the London *Stage* four or five years ago as 'Playwriting.' What it contains of most value is derived from Mr. Pinero and Mr. Grundy, who have contributed letters each describing the writer's own methods of dramatic work. These letters may be compared profitably with those which M. Abraham Dreyfus extracted from the leading French dramatists and printed in the *Revue Bleue* several years ago. Of local interest to British dramatists only are Mr. Calmoun's statements as to the cost of giving an experimental *matinée* of a new play in which its author may have faith enough to assume the expenses of setting it before the public. This method is more often adopted in London than in New York, and has its advantages, as Mr. Palmer proved when he gave his series of authors' *matinées* at the Madison Square Theatre four or five years ago;

but Mr. Calmoun's statements show that the cost of introducing a play to the public for a single performance varies from three to five hundred dollars. Thus we see how great a disadvantage the aspiring dramatist is at when compared with the aspiring novelist. Perhaps, however, it is as well that the beginner should not back with his own money his own judgment as to the merits of his play or his book, preferably waiting until a manager or a publisher happens along who can "see money in it."

The advice of Mr. Calmoun is meant to be practical. The advice of "M. Sésothène Rabichon" is meant to be ironic. The recipes for the theatrical kitchen which M. Germain has put into a little pamphlet are "wrote sarcastic." M. Germain is not trying to help the new dramatist, but merely to discredit the old dramatist, the trained theatrical hack who knows all the tricks of the trade. His method is the familiar one: "How to make a Bowery drama: Take a villain double-dyed and a virtuous hero. Add a heroine. Drop in abundant low-comedy characters. Mix to taste," etc., etc. In this spirit and in this manner M. Germain makes fun of the "curtain-raiser," of the *vaudeville à quiproquos*, of comedy, of melodrama, and of all the other forms of the drama as they survive in France to-day. His hand is light and facile, but his tongue is bitter.

Mr. Adams has given to his 'Book of Burlesque' a sub-title: "Sketches of English Stage Travestie and Parody," and he accomplishes his purpose in ten chapters, in which he first outlines the "Beginnings of Burlesque," the "Knight of the Burning Pestle," the "Rehearsal," Fielding's "Tom Thumb," Carey's "Chrononhotonthologos," the "Critic," and "Bombastes Furioso." This brings him to the pieces of pleasantry which Planché wrote, light, easy, witty. Then he traces the slow and steady descent to "The New Burlesque," to which his final chapter is devoted and for which the obvious criticism is that it is most lugubriously unfunny. The New Burlesque is to be seen at its brightest and best in "Little Jack Sheppard" and in "Faust Up to Date," and in "Joan of Arc" and in "Monte Cristo, Junior"—strange productions all of them, rarely humorous, often vulgar, and yet delighting the British public for hundreds and hundreds of nights. Mr. Adams gives extracts from the dialogue of these witless and artless pieces, and they are enough to make mankind blush that such sorry stuff should cause a laugh anywhere out of a lunatic asylum. That they should be offered to the readers of a volume purporting to belong to a "Library of Wit and Humor" is a strange thing; it casts a light on George Eliot's saying that "a difference of taste in jests is a great strain on the affections."

The Dunlap Society has now existed five years, and among the fifteen publications which it has issued, three a year, are reprints of four plays, Tyler's "Contrast," Burk's "Bunker Hill," and Dunlap's "Father" and "André." Among them there are also single volumes devoted to T. A. Cooper, Charlotte Cushman, John Gilbert, and W. E. Burton, besides the most useful series of theatrical biographies contained in the three parts of Mr. William Winter's 'Brief Chronicles.' But none of the publications of the Society is more interesting or in its way more useful than the two volumes of poetical addresses delivered in various American theatres since the first one was opened not a century and a half ago. The volume of 'Opening Addresses' was edited by

Mr. Laurence Hutton alone, but in the preparation of the volume of 'Occasional Addresses' he has had the assistance of Mr. William Carey. The verses here gathered together in chronological sequence begin with a poem written by Myles Cooper in 1773, and end with one written by Mr. G. P. Lathrop in 1890. Among the other poets are Sprague, Woodworth, G. P. Morris, A. B. Street, R. G. Conrad, Henry Timrod, John Brougham, Dr. Holmes, Mr. R. H. Stoddard, Mr. William Winter, Mr. George H. Jessop, and Mr. T. W. Parsons. Like all the publications of the Dunlap Society, 'Occasional Addresses' has been printed at the De Vinne Press, with the elegant simplicity for which that press is well known.

M. Paul Ginisty's volume is a haphazard collection of theatrical estrays—reviews of books, some of them, and newspaper articles called forth by some incident of the theatrical season, and even sketches in dialogue. There are nearly a score of them, all neatly turned, all light reading, and some of them worth reading. The best of them, or at least those of most interest, are on a show given by the *Compagnie des Sots*, on Lenau's "Faust," and on Mme. de Beaumarchais.

M. Larroumet's volume of studies in the history of dramatic literature is a book of another sort altogether. It is made up of articles on *Œdipus*, on Molière and Marivaux, on Shakspeare in France, on Beaumarchais, and on kindred topics, reprinted from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* and from the excellent *Revue Bleue*, all of them marked by solid knowledge and a charming style. Like M. Sarcey and M. Lemaitre, M. Larroumet is a scholar first of all, and like them, he is intensely fond of the theatre. To him the drama is as a living thing which he loves; therefore he is always investigating its past and always curious as to its future. Perhaps to the general reader in the United States the most interesting of his papers is that on Shakspeare, originally delivered as a lecture before the fifty-eighth performance of "Much Ado about Nothing" at the Odéon in 1888. Those among us who think that the Germans are the only foreigners who appreciate Shakspeare might read this paper with advantage—and no doubt with surprise.

From the Arctic Ocean to the Yellow Sea. By Julius M. Price, F.R.G.S. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

RECORDS of Siberian travel can hardly, as yet, be considered a drug in the market, but they threaten to rival, in number and in the diversity of views which they express, the works of travel in Africa. Mr. Price accompanied the expedition to the river Yenisei which started from London in July, 1890, with the object of continuing Capt. Wiggins's experiment of 1887—the establishment of a direct line of commerce between England and Siberia through the Kara Sea. In spite of the two unsuccessful attempts to pass the ice, made during the summers of 1888 and 1889, the feasibility of this route may be considered as demonstrated by the trip of the *Biscaya*, on which Mr. Price sailed as correspondent of the *London Illustrated News*, provided a mild season and good fortune supplement the skill of the mariners. That it can never be relied upon as a great commercial highway seems to be proved with equal clearness. Mr. Price's graphic narrative of the dangers, difficulties, and peculiarities of the voyage to Yeniseisk demonstrate this, and remind us of the fact that

gallant Capt. Wiggins and his companions on an earlier voyage were shipwrecked and forced to walk a very long distance, amid arctic cold and privations, before they reached help.

The book is founded on the correspondent's letters to the *Illustrated News*, and is, in substance, practically identical with them. Naturally, the reader expects a partisan discussion of the exile system as soon as the writer has fairly landed in Siberia, but all intention to furnish this is distinctly disavowed in the preface; and after noting the author's really impartial and sensible observations on other points which fell under his eye, we cannot refrain from placing a good deal of reliance upon his occasional remarks on the convicts and the system, although they do not coincide with many assertions which have previously been made. As an instance of his discrimination, even when he first arrives in the land and does not thoroughly grasp the situation, we may quote his experience in sketching and painting the peasant family at Kasanskoi. The man understood what was wanted of him, and sat quite rigid while Mr. Price sketched him, after having examined the cottage in detail without interference. When the artist spent the whole of the following day in painting the assembled family, the children were forbidden to talk loud or to go near him; every one went on with his occupations in a way to disturb him as little as possible; no one even showed any curiosity to see the result; and, to crown all, the peasant host prepared a repast of tea and cakes to refresh him in the afternoon. As he suggests, that sort of cavalier proceeding on the part of a stranger, in the midst of an English family, and that sort of treatment following, cannot be imagined. His error consists in attributing their conduct and their lack of curiosity to stolid indifference. Had this not been his first experience with a Russian peasant family, he would have recognized the fact that their conduct arose from inborn kindness and courtesy.

On numerous occasions, the authorities, voluntarily or on request, furnished Mr. Price with complete facilities for inspecting prisons and prison hospitals. He remarks, after the first of these occasions: "So far as I could judge, the criminals of Siberia have little to complain of. They pass their forced seclusion in absolute idleness, if they so wish, for the work they do, if any, is voluntary. Eating and sleeping, they while away the time as best they can, like so many caged beasts." On another occasion, he notes the remarkable fact that the prisoners are allowed to keep their pet dogs, cats, and pigeons, and are at perfect liberty inside the prison walls. Educated men, who have occupied good positions, and are guilty only of forgery or of petty misappropriations, are not obliged to associate with common criminals, but, though they travel with the same gang, they are kept apart, and may travel in their own conveyance if they have the money to pay for it, and are provided with a room to themselves at the *étapes*.

There is much which deserves quotation, but one of the most significant passages, which cannot be omitted, is the following:

"How any writer who has actually seen a gang of criminal exiles on the march can describe it as a pathetic sight, beats me; and my only astonishment is that convicts of other countries are not also spoken of in the same sentimental way, for they are probably worse off than Siberian criminals, who, as a matter of fact, have a much better time of it, considering their crimes, than they would have anywhere else, barring, of course, the trifling discomfort of

having to 'foot it' the whole distance if they are able. If they are footsore or lame, they are permitted to ride on one of the baggage conveyances. The more I learn about the prisoners' life, either on the road or in the *ostrogs* [prisons], the more astonished I am at the humane way in which they are treated, and how little is really known of it in the outer world. I am not referring to the system as a whole, which I am not only convinced is a wrong but a demoralizing one, but to minor details, which show a kindly feeling on the part of the authorities which is somewhat unexpected. For instance, all Jews or Mohammedans receive ten kopeks per day, both on the road and when in prison, so that they can purchase their own food and have it cooked according to their belief, the food and cooking being looked after by one of their own religion deputed by themselves. In a country where it is said that the Jews are so persistently persecuted by the authorities, this comes as rather an astounding revelation, in my opinion. I know nothing whatever about prison life in England, but I am anxious to know whether we treat our convicts in the same way. Political prisoners never march [unless they wish to do so], but are conveyed on telegas or sledges, according to the season, and always follow some distance behind the criminals, with whom they are never associated. [As to this last particular, Mr. Price agrees with the report of another English traveller in Siberia, Mr. de Windt.] For these 'unfortunates,' when not criminal ones, all one's sympathy is due; but the canaille marching on ahead, and who are thus most *en évidence*, in most cases richly deserve more than their fate, and ought to thank their lucky stars that they are Russian and not English convicts."

He also records that prisoners are allowed to work in prison for their own benefit, and describes the result of his getting some cigarettes made by one of them. Having made the discovery that "that most complete device for heating a house that was ever devised, the Russian stove, robs the Siberian winter of many of its terrors," that his thick flannels are intolerable, and that a single thin blanket is sufficient at night, he sensibly applies his observations to the prison rooms of the *étapes*, and argues that as "the heating arrangements were so complete, no covering was necessary" on the bare sleeping platforms. In the Irkutsk prison he found many men working at all sorts of trades, and working cheerfully. One man, an artist, had been allowed to fit up his solitary-confinement cell as a studio, and to paint what he pleased, and another executed orders for portraits and sacred images. The author remarks that this is permitted pending their sentence (they had already been convicted), but the artist added, with a smile, that "they would probably be able to do a little even at the mines if they behaved themselves." In Kiakhta he found an artist, a political exile under a long term of banishment, who showed him a mass of sketches relating to prisoners' life (a couple being reproduced in this volume), which the man had made during his long march across Siberia. "I could not help being strongly impressed," says Mr. Price, "with the idea that a system which would allow a prisoner to beguile the tedium of the march by following his artistic proclivities cannot, however faulty its theory may be, in practice be so cruelly *disciplinaire* as many would have us believe." Another fact worth noting, in view of the capital made by two recent travellers in Siberia of the filth of the post-houses and the hardships of the journey and the cold, is Mr. Price's praise of the general cleanliness of these houses, and the pleasure and comfort of the journey, except in one or two instances.

Although the author's English is slipshod at times, his book is very interesting, and his illustrations are profuse and good. The portion relating to Siberia is of the most importance, his description of the trip across the Desert of

Gobi and China to Peking being much inferior to Mr. de Windt's record of his journey over the same ground. It is evident, however, that Mr. Price was more favorably impressed with the manners of the wealthy Siberians than was Mr. de Windt, and the question naturally occurs to the reader: Does not this arise from the fact that they met different classes of the rich?

The Kansas Conflict. By Charles Robinson, late Governor of Kansas. Harper & Bros.

MANY have essayed to write the history of the Kansas conflict, but it has not yet been so well done that we can feel that none need make another trial. The earlier annalists were too near to the events to see their relative significance, and they trusted to vague rumor for much that subsequent investigation has entirely changed. Prof. Spring's 'Kansas,' in the series of State histories, was clearly an advance upon its predecessors, but the narrow limits of a single small volume cut off the author from those modifications and elaborations in which the truth of history resides. With Mr. Sanborn the Kansas conflict was but an incident in the personal history of John Brown; and his conception of the stout old Puritan as a person supernaturally inspired and sent was not favorable to a judicial estimate of his part in the general work, though it made it easy for him to accept the facts of Brown's connection with "the Pottawatomie executions" without the least misgiving. But Mr. Sanborn's rendering of the Kansas business was far from satisfactory to many who were concerned in it, and especially to two of the principal actors, the Hon. Eli Thayer, who made a splenetic deliverance two years ago, and the Hon. Charles Robinson, who has now stirred up his pure mind by way of remembrance and brought many strange and doleful things to light. There is much similarity in the temper of Mr. Thayer's book and of Mr. Robinson's. Each glorifies its author's name above all others; each spends most of its force in belittling persons who have been supposed to have something to do with freedom in Kansas and America; each is unsparing of its praise of the great hero of the other. "Without Eli Thayer the emigrants would not have come, and without Charles Robinson it would have been in vain that they did come." These words of the introduction are the common thesis of the two books, and it is maintained with ardor in them both. Thayer finds in Robinson "majesty of mind and humility of heart, stern justice and tender sympathy, heroic will and sensitive conscience, masculine strength and maidenly modesty, leonine courage and womanly gentleness," etc., etc., and Robinson's admiration of Thayer is almost equal to his own: "There was but one such in the nation"; a "David who seemed ready to challenge single-handed the Goliath of slavery"; his "broad, calm brow loomed up" at Emigrant Aid Company meetings with unrivalled splendor. The relations of Profs. Stubbs and Freeman were not more cordial when,

"—ladling freely from alternate tubs,
Stubbs buttered Freeman, Freeman buttered Stubbs,"

than those of these compatriots.

But for all the likeness in their books, there is much difference. The objects of their scorn are different. Thayer's are the Garrisonian abolitionists. Robinson's, too, are these, but they are much more violently John Brown and Jim Lane, for whom Thayer also had great contempt. Everything is relative, and in praising Robinson's modesty Thayer was, perhaps, thinking of his own, in comparison

with which Robinson's is immense. Not only does it express itself in his exclusive use of the third person singular in speaking of himself, but in a meagreness in the account of his own doings so remarkable that no one would ever suspect from his narrative that he was the man described by Mr. Thayer or the man he actually was. For he was, unquestionably, a very prominent and strong and useful man in the Kansas conflict, second to no other on the ground. But torn asunder between a natural modesty and a nervous anxiety for his reputation, he has wasted his strength in crying others down when a perfectly simple account of the conflict would have shown his *magna pars* in its true light.

A history of Kansas written nearly thirty years ago describes Robinson as made "peevish" by his hard experiences in the civil war, when Lane was preferred to him at Washington. The course of subsequent events has not restored him to his better self. Especially have the histories of Messrs. Sanborn and Thayer aggravated his self-consciousness and increased his vanity and irritation. He has, too, done more to make the Kansas conflict appear poor and mean and sordid than any one else has done or could do. Some of us have thought of it as a conflict in which high courage was involved, and noble generosity; and doubtless it was so, but it is hard to keep the faith while reading these chapters of bickering and recrimination. Every baser element is insisted on with wearisome iteration. If Robinson is to be trusted, the only virtue of the Free-State party was in its Fabian inaction, its refusal to lift a hand against the national Government or the national troops. The wisdom of such virtue was, perhaps, justified of her children, but it was not of a strain to quicken any generous ardor in the reader's breast, especially as it was associated with a hatred of the slave as great as, or even greater than, the hatred of slavery. The proportion of the Free-State party that was in favor of excluding free negroes from the Territory was always large. Gov. Robinson was not one of the negro-haters. In his passion for political equality for all races and both sexes, he came perilously near the sentiments of the abolitionists. But he was an eager politician, and the amount and quality of the politics of the unhappy Territory were melancholy features of the time.

Whatever Robinson's ability to lead the Free State party and to hold it to the policy of passive obedience to the Federal Government, his ability to write an interesting and instructive book about the things he saw and was a part of, is extremely small. One would not believe in advance that the story of events so stirring and important could be made so miserably dull. There is no clearness in the narration, and, if one does not know in advance the order of events, to disentangle it from these fragmentary chapters will be no easy matter. Forty pages are intruded about the author's life in California, which was an excellent preparation for his life in Kansas; but deserving of no such extended exhibition. Contemporary journalism is largely drawn upon, so largely that our sense of relationship with the author (if he should not be called the editor) of the volume is not a constant quantity. Orderly arrangement of his material there is none; for dates he has a great indifference, and the details of printing second the general negligence of his work: for example, the name of Andreas, whom he is always quoting, is written Andrea's in the possessive case oftener than not. But

the worst enemies of Gov. Robinson's historic sense are John Brown and Jim Lane; and Sanborn and Redpath and others who have spoken well of these. Let them come upon the scene, and the course of his narrative is forgotten while he goes off in a fresh tirade against them. His estimate of Lane's moral character is fair enough, but he does no justice to his picturesqueness. A character in which the elements of cowardice and of bravery were so strangely mixed, a man who had so much influence upon others, and so little government of his own spirit, of such fantastic dress and startling speech, with such a varied course and such a tragic end, would be a perfect godsend to an historian able to pounce upon his own with the unerring instinct of his art. For Gov. Robinson, Lane is little more than his personal rival, and all the dramatic possibilities of his wretched career are simply thrown away. That Lincoln, in his mistaken apprehension of Lane's character, favored his ambition in the civil war, is to Gov. Robinson a sufficient reason for putting him in the same pillory with Lane and Brown, and invoking for the three the universal scorn:

"One of these men, not receiving the punishment due for his crimes in Kansas, sought to inaugurate a servile war, the most revolting of all wars, and suffered the penalty prescribed by law. Another was overtaken in his crimes, and executed himself; while the third, although glorified for his proclamation freeing the slaves of the South, has the lustre of his fame and name terribly tarnished by his conduct of the war in the West, if not in the East."

Between Gov. Robinson and John Brown there was no such political rivalry as that between himself and Lane to fill up the measure of his hate, and still it does not lack for copious addition. With Brown alive he had no trouble; it is Brown's fame as one of the liberators of Kansas that infuriates his mind, and resolves him to destroy "the laurels of Miltiades" at whatever cost. So far as he succeeds, he does so at the cost of his own character for intelligence and discrimination. Many of Brown's friends were long in coming at the facts concerning the Pottawatomie massacre. Gov. Robinson was not one of these. As late as 1878 he wrote:

"I never had much doubt that Capt. Brown was the author of the blow at Pottawatomie, for the reason that he was the only man who comprehended the situation, and saw the absolute necessity of some such blow and had the nerve to strike it."

He now contends that the testimony of one Townsley, which Mr. Sanborn calls "true in the main," shows that the Pottawatomie victims were not deserving of their death. If that was so, Gov. Robinson's late discovery of the fact is most remarkable. But that does not affect "the absolute necessity of some such blow." Gov. Robinson now attempts to show that the blow did only harm, stirring up the pro-slavery party to make terrible reprisals. His late opinion here is no sufficient offset to the conviction held for a period of thirty years. He writes as if the disposition of the Missourians had been most amicable, when in fact the sack of Lawrence had happened within a few days. His whole recollection of the purpose and the meaning of events has been distorted by the necessity of depreciating John Brown's character and work in order that he may magnify his own.

Our Life in the Swiss Highlands. By John A. Symonds and his daughter Margaret. London: Adam & Chas. Black; New York: Macmillan. Pp. 366.

FOURTEEN years ago Mr. Symonds wrote for an English magazine an article on "Davos in Winter," in which he sang the praises of his dwelling-place as a resort for sufferers from lung disease. He dwelt on the fact that in this Alpine village, where the thermometer frequently falls to 10° to 15° below zero, "the most sensitive invalids can drive in open sledges with impunity, expose themselves without risk to falling snow through hours of exercise, or sit upon their bedroom balconies, basking in a hot sun, with the world all white around them, and a spiky row of icicles above their heads." At that time the cure of lung disease by Alpine air and sunshine was hardly known in England, and when Mr. Symonds resolved to go to Davos, his doctor replied that if he wished to leave his carcass to the Davos doctors, that was his affair; he had warned him. But Mr. Symonds went, and the result was that he who had, ever since he left school, never remained more than three months in one place, being always in search of a change of air for his health, made thenceforth his home in Davos, to which he has clung to this moment—the epilogue to his book is dated "Davos Platz, Feb. 13, 1892." Under the conditions described not only he has found health, but "the marvellous brain tonic of the mountain air" has enabled him to write about twenty-five books in prose and verse, notwithstanding the distance from literary centres and libraries.

Mr. Symonds, however, as he tells us on page 284, considers life itself a much graver and more important affair than literature, which is simply "an honest, healthful, harmless pastime." Accordingly he has little to say, even in the chapter "A Page of My Life," about his pursuit of literature or health, but devotes himself chiefly to a description of the numerous interesting phenomena which Switzerland presents during that time of the year when the tourists avoid it. Being an invalid, he cannot, of course, thrill the reader with narratives of dangerous mountain ascents, like Tyndall or Whympers; still, the description of a midnight journey through the ice and snow of a dangerous mountain pass, when even the driver reproached him for having ever undertaken it, and various other incidents, show that it was not a lack of courage, but a lack of lung power alone that prevented him from following in the footsteps of those famous climbers. The chapters contributed by Miss Symonds, including one on "Tobogganing on a Glacier," and another describing the still more dangerous feat of tobogganing down a snowfield on a bale of hay, show good descriptive power, and a courage that one would hardly expect of any one of her sex but an Englishwoman.

Mr. Symonds has many interesting facts to relate at first hand about the various kinds of avalanches, and about the Föhn wind, which the Swiss call the Schneefresser, or snow-eater, and which is no longer regarded as the sirocco of the Mediterranean coming heated from African deserts, but is believed to be generated in the upper regions under special atmospheric conditions. There are also a number of short sketches of mists, clouds, mountains, and valleys, interspersed with mountain-made sonnets, odes, and anecdotes. Hotel life is only casually dealt with, except in a sort of romance, "The Life of a Swiss Porter," which explains how those functionaries

succeed in acquiring so many foreign languages, and finally work their way up to the position of head porter, which is worth \$500 to \$1,000 a year, although the porter never receives a salary, and often has to pay \$150 or more for his place. Strange to say, Mr. Symonds approves of the tipping system which brings about this anomalous state of affairs; but his reasoning on this subject is the least convincing thing in his book.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Austen, Jane. *Mansfield Park*. 2 vols. Boston: Roberts Bros. \$2.50.
Bardoux, A. *La Jeunesse de La Fayette*. Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: Christern.
Bates, Arlo. *Told in the Gate*. Boston: Roberts Bros. \$1.25.
Black, W. *Madcap Violet*. Harpers.
Bosanquet, Bernard. *A History of Æsthetic*. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. \$2.75.
Cheal, J. *Practical Fruit Culture*. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. 75 cents.
Cobb, A. G. *Earth-Burial and Cremation*. Putnam. \$1.
Dolbear, Prof. A. E. *Matter, Ether, and Motion*. Boston: Lee & Shepard. \$1.75.
Duffy, Sir Charles G. *Conversations with Carlyle*. Scribners. \$1.75.
Fletcher, L. *The Optical Indicatrix, and the Transmission of Light in Crystal*. Macmillan.
Handley Cross; or, Mr. Jorrocks's Hunt. London: Bradbury, Agnew & Co.; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. \$2.25.
Harrison, Mrs. Burton. *Flower de Hundred*. Cassell. 50 cents.
Heard, John, Jr. *A Charge for France, and Other Stories*. Harpers. 50 cents.
Howell, Jeanne M. *A Common Mistake*. St. Paul: Price-McGill Co.
Johnston, C. F. H. *The Book of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.

Fine Arts.

LINTON'S MASTERS OF WOOD-ENGRAVING.

SINCE Mr. Linton ceased from the practice of wood-engraving, some thirteen years ago, he has devoted much time to investigating the history of his craft. We take our date from his paper on "Art in Wood-Engraving" in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1879. This was followed in the same year by a small book entitled "Some Practical Hints on Wood-Engraving"; in 1882, by the "History of Wood-Engraving in America." To write in his leisure a general history, was a task imposed upon him by his personal intimacy (if we may use the expression) with much of the material for such a work. Bewick died in 1823, the very year in which Linton was apprenticed. How fresh everything pertaining to the great "north-country master" must have been at this time. But Mr. Linton could also write of what John Thompson may have said about "developments" that were debasing the art in his day, and could report personally of Harvey, S. Williams, Powis, Orrin Smith, and numerous other notabilities who composed, with Mr. Linton himself, the great English school of woodcutters of two generations ago. He was, in fact, included by Chatto—in Jackson's "History of Wood-Engraving" (1888)—under the caption, "The English wood-engravers now living who, next to Charlton Nesbit and John Thompson, seem best entitled to honorable mention"; and for a full half century since that date he has more than maintained that distinction. All this constituted a pressing, an authoritative call to produce the work before us.* In form it is a small folio, with an ele-

*"The Masters of Wood-Engraving." By W. J. Linton. New Haven: The Author; London: B. F. Stevens.

gantly simple exterior—heavy covers, in olive-tinted linen, devoid of ornament other than the title in gold. Within we have antique paper and type, the letter-press and illustrations filling 215 pages, and being both provided with indices. The edition is of course limited—to five hundred signed and numbered copies, of which one hundred are on large paper.

Mr. Linton says in his preface:

"Want of any treatment of Wood-Engraving in a manner satisfactory to an engraver is the reason, and may be sufficient occasion, for my book. It is as an engraver and not as a bibliographer that I write. My purpose is not so much to give account of books in which engravings on wood have appeared, as to collect together the finest examples of the art, and to give its history through the exhibition of its Master Works."

After having had free access to the British Museum and other depositories of original prints, Mr. Linton still acknowledges a large indebtedness to Chatto; yet in reviewing the field of his predecessor's research, his own practical experience as an engraver enables him to throw fresh light upon the several topics, detecting a blemish here, and there bringing out a hidden lustre. This exhibition is arranged under three general heads, viz., Knife-work, Graver-work, and Chiaroscuro, the last alone being without subdivision into chapters, and all being accompanied with marginal notes, occasionally illustrated. In the first chapter, on "The Beginnings of Engraving," Mr. Linton goes over familiar ground with independent judgment. Because of the absence of connections for holding the interior portion in place, he discredits the production of monograms like those of Theodoric and Charlemagne from stencils rather than from engraved stamps. In the chapter on "Saints and Playing-Cards," discussing the priority of saint-pictures [*Helgen*] and cards respectively, he writes:

"Taking into consideration all the material for judgment I have been able to collect together, I subscribe to Chatto's conclusion, and cannot but believe that monastic leisure and ability first found opportunity for employment of woodcuts in the service of religion, and that the wage or profit to be had for an article of commerce in growing demand would be the later temptation of the card maker."

Mr. Linton objects, with reason, to judging of the relative antiquity of early prints by the quality of their execution, as the difference may well reside in the skill of the respective workmen. His second chapter is devoted to the "St. Christopher" of 1423, which passes for the earliest authentic woodcut, and "affords a specimen of the combined talent of the *Formschneider*, or wood-engraver, and the *Briefmaler*, or card-colorer." A full-page reproduction of this famous cut serves as a frontispiece to the book, and appears to have been colored, like the original, by hand. It is as near a facsimile as it were possible to give of every detail of every line, showing clearly the traits peculiar to knife-work. In the text the "Brussels Virgin" is introduced before a small copy of the "St. Christopher," as if by way of conceding its claim to priority. The former print was discovered in 1844 and bears the date 1418, but there are evidences of its having been tampered with. The "Annunciation," which was found pasted inside the cover of a manuscript volume with the "St. Christopher," is here reproduced in miniature, along with the "St. Bridget" and the "Berlin Virgin"—both these last, as well as the "Brussels Virgin," being unknown to Chatto.

"These prints may be taken as samples of a numerous series of pictures, popular in the early part of the fifteenth century, perhaps

earlier; all of the same character, little varying—altogether unvarying so far as the engraving is concerned. At first only pictures of Saints and Martyrs (illustrations of Bible story came later), they served as pious reminders, and, carrying out a precept of St. Gregory, filled the place of tracts or books to the illiterate multitude."

The Block Books, cut on planks in the manner of the *Helgen*, are next fully shown. Besides many illustrations of detail, there is a reproduction of an important page in each case. The '*Speculum Humanae Salvationis*' is, owing to the apparent use of movable type in connection with it, treated by itself. Comparison is afforded between different prints of the same subject as an aid to determining which is original and which a copy. Qualities of drawing, in Mr. Linton's view, should here outweigh clearness of print. On the debatable ground between wood and metal, we are introduced to the Alphabet in the British Museum, the '*Speculum Humanae Salvationis*,' the Brydenbach title-page, the '*Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*,' and a title-page from the '*Heures à l'usage de Chartres*' by Simon Vostre (about 1502). The pictures for which the last-named stands as representative, are very refined and beautiful; they display a new treatment in the "killing" an otherwise solid or black surface with *criblé* or dotted work. It has been assumed that these were "the finest possible specimens of early wood-engraving"; but evidences of the use of a stamp in producing the dots determine for our author that they were done on metal after the manner of wood-engraving.

It is a surprise at first to find under the head of Jerome of Nuremberg the work usually attributed to Albert Dürer, and Holbein's under the head Lützelburger. The engravings of Jerome from Dürer's drawings here given are a full-page each of the Holding of the Winds from Dürer's "Apocalypse," the Flight into Egypt from the "Life of the Virgin," Ecce Homo from the "Greater Passion," and four from the "Triumph of Maximilian." Another page print is "St. Jerome in Penitence," after Cranach. Lützelburger is represented by a number of small engravings after Holbein, principally from the "Dance of Death." They are marvels of exactitude and delicacy in facsimile cutting. It is interesting to study these masterpieces of early craftsmanship so familiarly, and in reproductions so convincingly faithful as to inspire almost the same reverence as the original impressions. Paper and type, too, are in admirable consonance with all this *Formschneider* work; but often the heliotype has been resorted to as conveying better the delicacy of old prints together with the primitive conditions of paper, ink, and press-work—e. g., in the case of the '*Ars Moriendi*' and the '*Biblia Pauperum*.' Or again, a like imitation has been effected with some of the smaller cuts by printing them on India paper and mounting them in the letter-press. The refinement thus achieved is the appearance of age. The concluding chapter on Knife-work ("Aldorfer to Papillon") contains brief notices of a number of little known and not highly esteemed artists, though Mr. Linton has a good word for Papillon as workman and as author of a "most exact and complete account of engraving with the knife; the method of execution, and all that could be wanted for its instruction."

"Graver Work" brings us in the second chapter to Bewick, from whose 'Fables,' 'Quadrupeds,' and 'Birds' a number of illustrations are selected, and a full page is assigned to the cut entitled "Waiting for Death."

These reproductions are far from doing justice to the genius of the father of modern wood-engraving, either because of the paper or because the resources of the pressman were not availed of as they might have been; a fact much to be regretted. Bewick's pupils are treated of in the chapter headed "Clennell and Nesbit," with the exception of his favorite Harvey, who is displaced to reappear in a later chapter—not, however, in token of Mr. Linton's depreciation. Of the "Assassination of Dentatus," our author declares that "it is not only a daring but a really magnificent and unequalled work."

This one engraving . . . would entitle Harvey to rank, if not among, yet closely to, our greatest." Branston and Thompson have a chapter with extensive illustrations, which suffer in the same way as Bewick's. Some of Thompson's cuts occur in a copy of the *Westminster Review* for August, 1838, which lies before us, and are beautifully printed, whereas in the 'Masters of Wood-Engraving' there is about them the lack of clearness that suited very well the old, faded-out work of the *Formschneider*. A similar comparison holds good between the clear, bright prints of the Arch of Titus by S. Williams, and Nineveh by Powis, in the *Westminster* collection, and the blurred, unsatisfactory prints in the 'Masters' (chapter "Aftermath"), notwithstanding the India proof. Powis's cut is subsequently referred to by Mr. Linton in controverting Hamerton's appreciation of American wood-engraving; and certainly there is nothing better in what Mr. Linton calls "the American development," nor anything so very different. To represent Orrin Smith, we wish he could have chosen the picture "Elba" in the *Westminster*, instead of the "Thibet Dog." As we recollect Smith's work, he was preëminently a landscape engraver of great excellence, rather than one who "excelled in animals."

The second division of the 'Masters' closes with the chapter "In the Winter," and here Mr. Linton has assigned him elf a place—too low, it might be deemed, and ill-supported by his choice of illustrations from himself: we doubt if a better example of the "near-enough" facsimile "which a well-trained Chinese rat would gnaw out with more nearness," could be found than his Edwin Booth in "Don Cæsar." The page of facsimile by Kretzschmar is unworthy of insertion in a collection of masterpieces. The portrait of Ludwig Richter, excepting the head, which closely resembles Mr. Linton's own manner, is not remarkable engraving. The portrait of Delacroix by Seriakoff is in contravention of all Mr. Linton has had to say about simplicity, being a mere imitation of the effects of copperplate. It is very doubtful, too, if many will share the opinion that Pannemaker is the exponent of a large class of French work; or that Jonnard's work "is of the best"; or that Ligny may be singled out from all the great engravers of Doré, while Pisan ("the Linton of France") deserves no mention. Neither can we see a reason for the "American development" being lugged in here without being allowed to speak for itself in black and white. In this part of his subject Mr. Linton is too near for historical perspective; but to discuss the question with him would lead us too far.

The concluding section, "Chiaroscuro," has reference to pictures produced by a printing from several blocks or metal plates engraved in relief. They are interesting, but of no great account. A page reproduction is given of "Adam and Eve" by Hans Baldung Grun (1511), in two printings.